

**INDIANA'S
CULTURAL RESOURCES
MANAGEMENT PLAN
For 2013 to 2019**

**Indiana Department of Natural Resources,
Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology**

December, 2012

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE STAFF

Robert E. Carter, Jr., Director of the Department of Natural Resources
State Historic Preservation Officer

James A. Glass, Ph.D., Director of the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

Environmental Review:

John L. Carr, Team Leader for Historic Structures Review
Cathy L. Draeger-Williams, Archaeologist
Amy L. Johnson, Senior Archaeologist and Archaeology Outreach Coordinator
James R. Jones III, Ph.D., State Archaeologist and Team Leader for Archaeology
Kim Marie Padgett, Historic Structures Reviewer
Rachel A. Sharkey, Records Check Coordinator
Chad W. Slider, Senior Historic Structures Reviewer
Wade T. Tharp, Archaeologist
Ashley D. Thomas, Historic Structures Reviewer

Financial Incentives:

Steven D. Kennedy, Assistant Director for Financial Incentives, Administration, & Planning
David B. Duvall, Historical Architect
Malia D. Vanaman, Associate Grants Manager

Preservation Services:

Frank D. Hurdis, Jr., Assistant Director for Preservation Services
Jenny Ahrends, Historic Sites and Structures Surveyor
Amy E. Borland, Architectural Historian
Paul C. Diebold, Team Leader for Survey and Registration
Travis Olson, Historic Sites and Structures Surveyor
Jeannie R. Regan-Dinius, Director of Special Initiatives
Sydney Schoof, Historic Sites and Structures Surveyor
Holly A. Tate, Architectural Historian

State Historic Architecture and Archaeological Resource Database (SHAARD):

Miriam L. Burkett, SHAARD Specialist
Terri S. Dorsey, SHAARD Data Input Operator
Sara Michelle Head, SHAARD Data Input Operator
Tiffany N. Howard, SHAARD Data Input Operator
Amy E. Marisavljevic, SHAARD Data Input Operator
Darlina G. Shaw, SHAARD Data Input Operator
Marlina L. Shaw, SHAARD Data Input Operator

Support Staff:

Susan L. Judy, Administrative Assistant

Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology
402 W. Washington St., Room #W274, Indianapolis, IN 46204
Phone: 317-232-1646 FAX: 317-232-0693 E-mail: dhp@dnr.IN.gov
Web: www.IN.gov/dnr/historic

TABLE OF CONTENTS

State Historic Preservation Office Staff.....	2
The Statewide Plan Advisory Committee.....	4
Acknowledgments.....	6
A Letter from the State Historic Preservation Officer.....	7
Executive Summary.....	8
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	9
• The State Historic Preservation Office	
• The Purpose of the Statewide Preservation Plan	
• The Timeframe for This Plan	
• What Are Cultural Resources?	
• Why Is Preservation Important?	
• Who Should Use This Plan?	
• The Importance of Partnerships	
Chapter 2: The Context for Preservation in Indiana.....	13
• An Overview of Indiana’s Cultural Resources	
• Surveys to Identify and Document Cultural Resources	
• Building a Comprehensive Cultural Resources Database	
• What the Cultural Resources Database Tells Us So Far	
• A Quick Demographic Overview of Indiana	
• Accomplishments From the Previous Planning Cycle (2005-2012)	
Chapter 3: The Planning Process.....	23
• Developing a Statewide Survey	
• Promoting the Statewide Survey	
• Public Participation in the Planning Process	
• The Statewide Plan Advisory Committee	
Chapter 4: A Plan for Cultural Resource Management in Indiana.....	27
• Challenges and Opportunities	
• What the Public Told Us Through the Survey	
• Goals, Objectives, and Strategies	
Chapter 5: A Call to Action – How <u>You</u> Can Help.....	38
Appendix A: Indiana’s On-Line Survey.....	41
Appendix B: Results of the On-Line Survey.....	48
Appendix C: Plan Goals, Objectives, and Strategies from 2005 to 2012.....	64
Glossary.....	67
Bibliography.....	69

This publication was financed in part with federal funds from the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, administered by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology. However, the contents and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of the Interior, nor does the mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation by the U.S. Department of the Interior. Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the U.S. Department of the Interior prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, or disability in its federally assisted programs. If you believe that you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility as described above, or if you desire further information, please write to: Office of Equal Opportunity, National Park Service, 1849 C. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240.

THE STATEWIDE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To insure that this revised preservation plan would be responsive to the broad spectrum of preservation concerns and statewide interests, the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) formed a committee to give more in-depth input and guidance within the planning process as well as to review the final draft of the plan goals. The following individuals accepted the invitation to assist the DHPA in the planning process. In addition to a wide variety of disciplines and perspectives, they also brought geographic diversity to the committee by representing 18 of Indiana's 92 counties. Their counties of residence are indicated in parentheses.

The DHPA wishes to thank these individuals for their time, guidance, and valuable insights:

Christopher Baas, Assistant Professor, Department of Landscape Architecture, Ball State University (Hamilton Co.)

David L. Baker, Administrator, Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission (Marion Co.)

Christopher J. Baltz, President, Indiana Archaeology Council (Lawrence Co.)

David C. Barksdale, Floyd County Historian (Floyd Co.)

Julie Berry, President, Board of County Commissioners, Jefferson County (Jefferson Co.)

Richard Butler, Vice Chair, Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board (Dearborn Co.)

Duncan Campbell, Associate Professor and Director, Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, Department of Architecture, Ball State University (Delaware Co.)

Edward Clere, State Representative, House District 72, Indiana General Assembly (Floyd Co.)

Rhonda Deeg, Director of Programs, Historic Madison, Inc. (Jefferson Co.)

Mark Dollase, Vice President of Preservation Services, Indiana Landmarks (Marion Co.)

Brigadier General J. Stewart Goodwin, USAF (Ret), Executive Director, Indiana War Memorial Commission (Marion Co.)

Jeff Harris, Director, Local History Services, Indiana Historical Society (Marion Co.)

Fritz Herget, P.E., President, Arsee Engineers Inc. (Marion Co.)

John P. Hodson, President & Founder, Kankakee Valley Historical Society (Porter Co.)

Catherine D. Hostetler, Director, Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend & St. Joseph County (Certified Local Government) (St. Joseph Co.)

Susan B. Hyatt, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Department of Anthropology, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (Marion Co.)

Louis D. Joyner, Architect, Louis Joyner, Architect (Bartholomew Co.)

Daniel C. Kloc, AIA, NCARB, Facility Architect, St. Vincent Health; and Member, Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board (Hamilton Co.)

Shae Kmicikewycz, Program Manager, Indiana Main Street, Indiana Office of Community & Rural Affairs (Hendricks Co.)

Mike Linderman, Western Regional Manager for State Historic Sites, Indiana State Museum & Historic Sites Corporation (Vanderburgh Co.)

Beth K. McCord, Senior Principal Investigator and Branch Manager, Gray & Pape, Inc. (Delaware Co.)

Brian Keith McCutchen, Superintendent, George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior (Knox Co.)

Laura J. Minzes, Deputy Director of Historic Sites, Structures & Land, Indiana State Museum & Historic Sites Corporation (Johnson Co.)

Marta Moody, Executive Director, Delaware-Muncie Metropolitan Plan Commission (Delaware Co.)

Elizabeth Osborn, Ph.D., Assistant to the Chief Justice for Court History & Public Education, Indiana Supreme Court (Morgan Co.)

Rochelle K. Owen, AICP, Director of Community Programs, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development (Marion Co.)

Staffan Peterson, Ph.D., Manager, Cultural Resources Office, Indiana Department of Transportation (Monroe Co.)

Ron Ross II, Vice President, MartinRiley Architects-Engineers (Allen Co.)

Philip V. Scarpino, Ph.D., Professor of History and Director of Public History, Department of History, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (Marion Co.)

Vi Simpson, State Senator, Senate District 40, Indiana General Assembly (Monroe Co.)

Kisha Tandy, Assistant Curator of Social History, Indiana State Museum & Historic Sites Corporation (Marion Co.)

Linda Weintraut, Ph.D., President, Weintraut & Associates, Inc. (Boone Co.)

Kathleen Weissenberger, Director, Grant Services Division, Indiana Office of Community & Rural Affairs (Marion Co.)

Of the 45 committee invitees, 33 accepted the invitation. Twelve committee invitees either declined to participate or did not respond to the invitation. They included: a mayor, a state agency representative, two Native American leaders in Indiana, a university archaeologist, a developer specializing in the use of rehabilitation tax credits, a member of an avocational archaeology group, a cemetery preservation advocate, a member of a friends group for a historic site, a member of a grassroots preservation organization, a realtor with specialty in historic homes, and a planner for a military organization. Although the committee's perspectives would have been even broader if all 45 invitees participated, the DHPA knew from past experience that 100% participation was not realistic. Nevertheless, a 73% participation rate was considered to be a very successful response, and those who did serve brought a wide variety of perspectives to the committee.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology wishes to thank the following organizations and individuals for their part in developing this *Cultural Resources Management Plan*:

Interns Hilary Retseck and Curtis Barsic from the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis Graduate Program in Public History and Jacob Dobbs from the Ball State University Program in Public History provided valuable assistance to the DHPA staff during development, promotion, and management of the on-line survey;

Dawn Krause in the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Communications gave guidance on how best to structure the on-line survey, then built and managed the survey, and ran periodic reports for the DHPA;

Russ Dotzauer in the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Management Information Systems helped retrieve and quantify cultural resource data from the DHPA's State Historic Architecture and Archaeological Resource Database;

Staff and members of Certified Local Government historic preservation commissions in Bloomington, Crown Point, Elkhart, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Huntington, Lafayette, Logansport, LaPorte, Mishawaka, Monroe County, Muncie, Nappanee, New Albany, Newburgh, Richmond, St. Joseph County, and South Bend greatly assisted the DHPA by promoting the survey throughout their communities and counties;

Members of the Statewide Plan Advisory Committee helped promote the survey, considered the survey data and the relevance of the previous plan's goals, shared their perspectives, and gave guidance for the direction of new goal statements;

Members of the Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board included Chairman Robert E. Carter, Jr., Vice Chair Richard Butler, Jim Corridan, Daniel C. Kloc, Kevin Orme, Joshua D. Palmer, William L. Selm, and Mitch Zoll; this public oversight board gave thoughtful consideration and official endorsement to the goals, objectives, and strategies;

Members of the public who took the survey and shared their opinions, especially those people who also promoted the survey within their communities and encouraged others to participate;

The DHPA's Survey Development Committee included Amy Borland, Amy Johnson, Steve Kennedy, Jeannie Regan-Dinius, Hilary Retseck, Holly Tate, Ashley Thomas, and Malia Vanaman; this group invested many hours in crafting the survey;

The DHPA's Plan Development Committee included Miriam Burkett, Frank Hurdis, Amy Johnson, Steve Kennedy, Holly Tate, and Malia Vanaman; this group painstakingly reviewed and quantified the survey data, including more than 2,000 individual narrative responses, in order to develop the new goal, objective, and strategy statements;

Susan L. Henry Renaud at the National Park Service was instrumental in development of Indiana's first *Cultural Resources Management Plan* in 1998 and the first plan revision in 2005, and provided guidance during the initial stages of this plan revision before her retirement in 2011;

Tanya Gossett of the National Park Service provided valuable advice, guidance, and feedback during the final stages of this plan revision.

A LETTER FROM THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER



Indiana Department of Natural Resources

Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr., Governor
Robert E. Carter, Jr., Director

November 1, 2012

Dear Fellow Hoosiers:

I am happy to present Indiana's new Cultural Resources Management Plan. It is the result of two years of intensive efforts by the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, working with people from across the state who are engaged in preservation of the places that have special meaning for us.

The plan found that both challenges and opportunities lie ahead as we strive to increase wise stewardship of our cultural resources. The fast pace of change, disinvestment in older sections of our cities and in rural areas, decreased new investment in historic structures, and lack of awareness of the economic benefits of preservation are challenges. We also have opportunities to seize in the next decade. Investments in older buildings tend to create more jobs than new construction and bring more spending and tax revenues to local communities. Small business owners, artists, and visitors are drawn to big city cultural districts, small town centers, and the traditional Hoosier landscape. Heritage tourism is projected to be a growth industry as the economy recovers.

As the plan goals indicate, much of our focus in the next seven years needs to be in increasing public awareness and support for preservation. We need to broaden the preservation movement in Indiana to include all those who are practicing preservation but may not have thought of themselves as preservationists. We must advocate preservation options in community planning and development decisions. And we must persuade more community and business leaders of the economic benefits of investing in community heritage.

We are fortunate in Indiana to enjoy a long history of habitation by human cultures extending back nearly 10,000 years. As many as a thousand mounds in every part of the state recall the presence of prehistoric peoples. New research has identified archaeological sites left by modern Native American nations and by those who lived here during the settlement and early industrial periods of Indiana history. The plan also proposes new awareness-building and partnerships to conserve more of our important below-ground history.

I want to thank all of you that gave us guidance on priorities for the new plan through the on-line survey in 2011 and thank in particular the members of the Statewide Plan Advisory Committee for their valuable comments and suggestions.

We look forward to working with all of you, our partners, as we use this plan as a guide for our efforts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. E. Carter, Jr.", is written over the typed name.

Robert E. Carter, Jr.
State Historic Preservation Officer

An Equal Opportunity Employer
Printed on Recycled Paper

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the second periodic revision of *Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan* by the Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA). It is a seven-year guide for the period 2013 to 2019, which includes the 200th anniversary of Indiana's statehood in 2016.

This statewide plan satisfies requirements of the National Park Service – the federal agency that administers national preservation programs – for Indiana's continued eligibility to receive sizeable annual grants from the Historic Preservation Fund. This funding source enables the DHPA to administer its annual matching subgrant program, which helps many organizations and communities statewide undertake important local heritage preservation activities.

The primary purposes of this plan are to coordinate heritage-related activities among all stakeholders, and to serve as a guide for preservation decision-making at all levels. To achieve that end, this plan must be widely disseminated, considered, and supported by individuals and agencies, professionals and property owners, elected officials and environmentalists, developers and downtown business owners, and local governments and concerned citizens alike.

This document represents significant input from thousands of Hoosiers from all across the state, as well as many hours of hard work by the staff of the DHPA to analyze this data and develop responsive preservation goals, objectives, and strategies for Indiana. The following pages summarize:

- The importance of this plan and who should use it;
- An overview of Indiana's broad range of cultural resources;
- Ways the public participated in the planning process; and
- What the public told us through an on-line survey.

The plan culminates in four new goals to guide preservation activities, as well as a “call to action” that suggests ways heritage stakeholders can take meaningful actions in their own communities.

A Vision for Preservation in Indiana

Working in cooperation, citizens, organizations, and agencies can help make Indiana a place where preservation of heritage resources is a mainstream Hoosier value – a place where the general public is aware of cultural resources and supports preservation efforts, a place where most Hoosiers feel like they are stakeholders in the preservation of cultural resources, a place where citizens and local leaders have open dialogue about preservation issues and routinely consider cultural resources within their decision-making, and a place where people understand both the economic and environmental benefits of preservation.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

The Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) is the designated State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for Indiana. The DHPA's location within the Indiana Department of Natural Resources mirrors the structure of the federal government's official preservation agency; the National Park Service is located within the U.S. Department of the Interior. As the state-level counterpart to the National Park Service, the DHPA is the key partner for federal preservation programming in Indiana.

The DHPA's staff of about 30 people includes professional preservationists, archaeologists, and historians, as well as support staff and contract employees. The director of the DHPA is the Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer. Together, the director and staff of the DHPA are charged with the day-to-day administration of state and federal programs for preservation and archaeology in Indiana.

The DHPA carries out provisions of both the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended and the Indiana Historic Preservation and Archaeology Act (IC 14-21-1). Regular duties of the SHPO include identifying and documenting historic structures and archaeological sites, processing nominations to the State and National Registers, conducting legally required reviews of state and federally assisted projects for the consideration of cultural resources, and managing financial incentive programs for preservation activities. In addition, the office promotes heritage education for the general public, manages a statewide database of above-ground and below-ground cultural resources, develops new initiatives to address identified needs, and engages in partnerships and collaborative efforts that will help achieve Indiana's goals for cultural resource management and preservation education.

THE PURPOSE OF THE STATEWIDE PRESERVATION PLAN

The National Historic Preservation Act requires each State Historic Preservation Office to prepare and implement a comprehensive plan for cultural resource management. This plan must be developed with very broad-based public input, not just feedback from preservation and archaeology constituents. In addition, the plan must fit the state's unique circumstances and characteristics, consider the full range of cultural resources present in the state, encourage consideration of preservation concerns within planning efforts at all levels, and it must be implemented by routine operations of the State Historic Preservation Office. Finally, expenditure of federal Historic Preservation Fund grants to the state must be linked to and guided by the cultural resource management plan. Periodically, this plan must be revisited and revised so that it remains current.

The intentions of the goals, objectives, and strategies contained in this plan are to coordinate heritage-related activities, guide preservation-related decision-making at all levels, encourage collaboration and partnerships where possible, broaden awareness of and appreciation for cultural resources, and make support for preservation a mainstream value among Hoosiers.

THE TIMEFRAME FOR THIS PLAN

This second revision of *Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan* will be in effect for seven years, from 2013 through 2019. During the first two years (2013-2014), the new plan will be introduced and disseminated statewide to raise awareness of these goals among new and existing preservation partners as well as the general public. Throughout the seven-year timeframe, the DHPA staff will gear its own efforts and resources towards meeting the new goals, and it will assist others in doing the same. During the last two years of this plan cycle (2018-2019), the

DHPA staff will evaluate the effectiveness of this plan's goals, gather new public input, identify emerging issues and concerns, and prepare the next revision of *Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan*.

WHAT ARE CULTURAL RESOURCES?

Cultural resources are the vestiges of an extremely long and diverse heritage of human occupation, such as archaeological sites, buildings, structures, objects, and landscape features. They are physical connections to our common past, and they tell us about who we are as Hoosiers. Most people recognize county courthouses, mansions, and Native American mounds as being culturally significant properties, but there are so many more resources that together tell the story of Indiana, its communities, and its people.

It would be impossible to list all of our state's cultural resources, so they are often considered by groups or categories. Resource types tell a lot about specific periods in history – like early statehood or the Civil War era, or about specific themes – like industrial technology or transportation. Some of the better-known resource types include Native American village sites, one-room schoolhouses, covered bridges, Carnegie Libraries, historic downtowns, and railroad depots. Some of the less recognized resource types include small archaeological sites dating back thousands of years, neighborhoods of workers' cottages, African American settlements, cemeteries, farmsteads and barns, formally designed park and boulevard networks, Art Deco movie theaters, and many others. In general, cultural resources are more than 50 years old and retain some degree of integrity – that is, buildings and structures retain their appearance and character from when they were built or became significant.

Cultural resource management requires consideration of the wide-ranging needs of all types of sites and structures, both above and below ground. This includes identifying resource types and individual resources, recognizing specific threats to those resources, recognizing economic possibilities as well as limitations, working with constituent groups and property owners, engaging in public education initiatives, developing programs to meet preservation needs, and working together as partners to protect and preserve our heritage.

WHY IS PRESERVATION IMPORTANT?

Preservation is more than saving single sites or buildings; preservation maintains features of our environment and communities that contribute to our overall quality of life. Although part of a larger American history, Indiana has its own unique heritage of early peoples, settlement, development, industry, and culture. Those qualities that are truly "Hoosier" are embodied in places from Evansville to South Bend, Terre Haute to Richmond, New Albany to Gary, and Vincennes to Fort Wayne. There are no other places quite like Angel Mounds State Historic Site, the Utopian experiment town of New Harmony, the 19th century downtowns of Attica and Rockville, the early 20th century resort communities of French Lick and West Baden, the planned worker community of Marktown in East Chicago, and the Modernist architectural jewels of Columbus. There is uniqueness to the neighborhoods, downtowns, parks, and boulevards in Lafayette, Madison, Paoli, Whiting, and Indianapolis. All of Indiana's communities, large and small, convey a "sense of place" that is like no other.

Many people understand that preservation of cultural resources has a number of intangible benefits:

- Cultural resources improve our understanding of the past and can be used to create educational opportunities for teaching about history and culture.
- Preserving cultural resources demonstrates respect for past generations while leaving a legacy for future generations.
- Preservation activity makes for livable communities by retaining community character and "sense of place."

However, many people do not recognize the significant environmental and economic benefits of preservation, which now are more important than ever. Here are a few examples of how preservation saves energy and money and can generate revenue:

- Reusing historic buildings saves the limited space in landfills and helps these facilities last longer. Debris from demolished buildings is often the largest component of the waste stream that goes into landfills.
- Saving historic buildings conserves vast amounts of “embodied energy” that has already gone into manufacturing building materials, transporting them to the site, and assembling them. Replacing a historic building with a new one – even a very energy efficient one – leaves a huge carbon footprint, as it wastes the embodied energy of the old building, and requires still more energy to demolish the building, transport the debris to the landfill, manufacture new materials, ship the new materials to the site, and construct the new building.
- Reusing historic buildings, especially housing stock, can reduce sprawl and save open space and prime farmland. Reducing sprawl saves money because the public doesn’t have to pay to build and maintain as much infrastructure, like roads, sidewalks, sewer and water lines, and sometimes even bigger public investments like schools and fire stations.
- Rehabilitating historic buildings is an inherently labor-intensive activity, which means jobs for local workers. Budgets for preservation projects generally include more money for wages than for construction materials, since a building already exists and isn’t being built from the ground up. Money paid for construction materials tends to leave a community for a corporation located elsewhere. However, money paid for wages circulates within the local economy and also generates local and state income tax revenue.
- Revitalized historic buildings bolster neighboring property values and increase the tax base of the community. Vacant buildings can drag down property values, often generate little or no property tax revenue, and can be attractive targets for crime and vandalism.
- Preservation activity can bring tourism dollars into communities, as heritage tourists tend to stay longer and spend more money in places they visit than average tourists.

The combination of preserving our unique heritage and improving the economic health of our communities creates a sense of pride and ownership among Indiana’s citizens, whether they were born Hoosiers or became Hoosiers. Our statewide community encompasses Native Americans, the descendants of the French, Irish, African-American, German, and Italian settlers, the growing demographic of more recent Hispanic and Eastern European immigrants, and the highly mobile young American population. Whether our ancestors occupied this territory for generations or we are newly transplanted in Indiana, we are a community that shares responsibility for stewardship of the Hoosier heritage that we have inherited in the 21st century.

WHO SHOULD USE THIS PLAN?

This document is not simply a task list for the DHPA. *Indiana’s Cultural Resources Management Plan* is for all heritage stakeholders and advocates who believe in protecting and preserving cultural resources, making them important and economically viable components of Indiana communities today, and safeguarding them for future generations use, learn from, and enjoy. The list of heritage stakeholders includes, but is not limited to:

- Preservationists and cultural resource managers and consultants;
- Professional and avocational archaeologists;
- Historians and history enthusiasts;
- Advocates, supporters, and “friends” of individual heritage sites or entire classes of resources;
- Heritage tourists as well as tourism and hospitality workers;
- Librarians, archivists, genealogists, and researchers;
- Educators and students;
- Environmentalists, conservationists, and outdoor enthusiasts;
- Occupants of historic properties, including owners, renters, and lease-holders alike;
- Downtown business owners, workers, and shoppers;
- A wide variety of professionals, like architects, engineers, planners, and realtors;

- Developers, investors, and economic development staff;
- Elected officials at all levels;
- Municipal, county, state, and federal government employees, especially those who craft policies and make decisions affecting the built environment and open spaces;
- Members of the general public; and
- YOU!

Using this plan, communities can creatively address their own preservation concerns, challenges, and opportunities. This document can also serve to open a dialogue with non-preservationists to find common ground for building healthy economic development, responsible community growth, and an appreciation for Indiana's past as well as its future.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PARTNERSHIPS

Preservation activity will not be effective when it is driven only by a single state government agency or by any organization or individual working without the benefit of collaboration. Preservation efforts are most effective when partnerships are developed to accomplish parallel missions and achieve mutual goals. This plan provides a vision and a blueprint for partners to work together to educate Hoosiers about the importance and value of historic preservation and archaeology, to strengthen protection efforts for Indiana's heritage, and to promote preservation and revitalization efforts for all types of resources. Just as this preservation plan was developed with input from many people and organizations all around Indiana, so it must be carried out by state, regional, and local partners working together in every county and every community.

CHAPTER 2: THE CONTEXT FOR PRESERVATION IN INDIANA

AN OVERVIEW OF INDIANA'S CULTURAL RESOURCES

The earliest humans known to live, hunt, gather, and forage in what we now call Indiana were Paleoindians who were specialists in hunting for large game at the end of the last phase of the Ice Age, approximately 10,000 years ago. Although the Paleoindian population was not large, they have left evidence of their presence in almost every present-day Indiana county as well as at scattered habitation sites like the Alton site on the Ohio River. Early Archaic peoples, though still nomadic, seasonally exploited the environment, produced a wide variety of tools, and left evidence in such notable places as the Swan's Landing site in Harrison County; this site is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The legacy of prehistoric occupation in Indiana is diverse and varied and includes, for example, campsites, villages, cemeteries and burials, house basins, trash pits, shell middens, and hearths, in addition to examples of distinctive projectile points. The Bluegrass site in Warrick County has offered up evidence of the range of occupational activity that was taking place in the Mid-Late Archaic period. Archaeologists have also learned much about the increased occurrence of Late Archaic settlement and lifeways from sites and villages such as the McKinley site in Hamilton County.

Earthen mounds and earthworks are perhaps the most well known of Indiana's prehistoric resources. The earliest of these dates from the latter stages of the Late Archaic period, c. 4000-1500 B.C., but they are often identified in the public's mind with such sites as those at the Woodland site at Mounds State Park in Madison County and the Mississippian Angel Mounds Site, a designated National Historic Landmark (NHL), in Vanderburgh County.

The arrival of the first Europeans in the second half of the 17th century ushered in a new phase of human activity that resulted in associated archaeological sites. Indiana counts among its historic archaeological legacy those places where the earliest European explorers and settlers left traces of their various settlement and subsistence traditions from building practices to agriculture. Fort Ouiatenon, built on the banks of the Wabash River in 1717 by French soldiers and traders, served as an outpost to guard against British expansion in the region and as a place where fur trade with native Wea tribes occurred. Another demonstration of European settlement, this from the first decade of the 19th century, is illustrated at the Musee de Venoge in Switzerland County, where investigations have revealed the contributions of early Swiss settlers.

In the 19th century, Hoosiers worked in a range of manufacturing and industrial environments, some of which may best be understood by the archaeology they left behind. Kilns, quarries, forges, and canal beds yield some of the information with which we understand earlier industrial methods, while shipwrecks like the Muskegon Shipwreck site in the Indiana waters of Lake Michigan hold information about how the products of Hoosier labor were transported.

The rapid expansion of Indiana cities in the second half of the 20th century often resulted in major demolition of existing buildings or even replacement of entire neighborhoods. Most of the Indiana Avenue area, on the west side of downtown Indianapolis, was the victim of such a fate. Urban archaeology has brought back into focus some of those places and the lifeways of the people who lived in them.

The first Europeans to explore Indiana wilderness constructed temporary shelters, none of which remain today. The earliest documented residential buildings in the state reveal traditional French building technology and log construction brought by Scots-Irish settlers moving north of the Ohio River from eastern Kentucky, West Virginia, and the Carolinas. As early as 1803 Indiana saw its first grand "high style" house when William Henry Harrison, Governor of the Indiana Territory, built "Grouseland" in Vincennes in the Federal style. From that point forward a parade of 'styled' residential design began that continues to today. Each subsequent phase of the stylistic trends

that coursed through the American architectural landscape is represented in the state's inventory, many of which have been listed in the National Register.

Vernacular houses make up the bulk of the Indiana's housing stock. The state inventory of historic sites and structures has identified various I-house types, hall and parlor plans, double pens, and shotgun houses whose locations trace the pattern of early settlement in the state.

Carpenter-builders and trained architects in the early 19th century like Mathew Temperly, Francis Costigan, and Isaiah Rogers demonstrated their skill in house design. Some builders relied on popular pattern books and carpenters' manuals for guidance in producing architectural details. The interpretations of high style elements that they created enrich those rural townships and neighborhoods where they have survived. In the second half of the 19th century and throughout the 20th century, professionally schooled and trained architects contributed to the collection of high-style residences around the state in styles ranging from Second Empire to eclectic revival styles.

Hoosiers expressed the need for community by creating distinctive residential developments during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Historic districts like Lincolnshire in Evansville, Southwood Park in Fort Wayne, and Chapin Park in South Bend represent complete historic environments.

More recently, in the explosion of housing construction following World War II, whole residential neighborhoods were platted, many oriented more toward interstate highways and regional shopping malls than toward downtowns. The earliest of these developments have become eligible for National Register evaluation with at least one, the Thornhurst neighborhood in Hamilton County, listed in the National Register.

Indiana's earliest towns almost universally followed the grid plan that was encouraged by the land distribution formula specified in the Land Ordinance of 1785. Two variations were the plans for Jeffersonville and Indianapolis. Jeffersonville, whose checkerboard plan was proposed by Thomas Jefferson, lost its regular blocks of open space almost immediately. In Indianapolis, the central Monument Circle continues to be a focal point of civic identity from the 1821 Mile Square plan of Alexander Ralston and Elias P. Fordham, while portions of the original diagonal avenues survive.

A complement of public and commercial buildings rapidly supplemented the housing stock in the state's earliest towns including storefronts, churches, and, in county seats, courthouses. Two examples of the early foursquare courthouses survive in Corydon and Rome, Indiana. The majority of county seats have witnessed several campaigns of courthouse rebuilding, yielding a spectrum of architectural styles in these most important governmental monuments. Indiana takes pride in the fact that all of its currently eligible courthouses are listed in the National Register.

Most of the earliest commercial buildings around the state either have not survived or were substantially altered in the late 19th and 20th centuries. The general format of these buildings – narrow, deep, masonry construction of two to three floors above a storefront – remained very constant into the early years of the 20th century changing mainly in their stylistic detailing. The state's inventory of National Register listed properties includes historic districts that represent the evolution in commercial design over the decades. A number of those districts also include opera houses, like the recently rehabilitated Vurpillat's Opera in Winamac, and community movie theaters, like the Fowler Theater, that have added to the vibrancy of night life in the districts.

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 required a set aside of one section in each surveyed township in the Northwest Territory to encourage public education. A number of Indiana's township schools have survived with some, like Howard School in Boone County, being interpreted to connect Hoosier fourth graders to local history. Twentieth century consolidated elementary and high schools in towns and cities around the state, although no longer used for education, have been successfully converted in a number of cases to housing or office space. Additionally, Indiana's public and private colleges and universities often have retained early buildings or campus cores that have served to anchor campus plans as they have expanded over time.

Spiritual expression over Indiana's two hundred year history has produced landmark places of spiritual and sacred significance and worship, outstanding funerary art and architecture in cemeteries big and small from South Bend to Evansville, and places like Camp Chesterfield in Madison County, headquarters of the Indiana Association of Spiritualists. The majority of religious resources range from small rural churches to grand, revival style edifices; however, three of the state's National Historic Landmarks designated under the theme "*Modernism in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Design and Art in Bartholomew County*" are among the nation's most important examples of Modern architecture.

Although Indiana is usually identified as an agricultural state, it has an important industrial history as well that has produced a rich assortment of resources. The earliest industry was associated with subsistence settlement – saw mills along rivers and creeks that assisted the expansion of the built environment. Information gathered from such sites as Virginia Ironworks in Monroe County has helped to better understand early industrial activity. As the state moved to a market economy, grist mills, like Adams Mill in Carroll County, produced hundreds of barrels of flour and corn meal per day. When it was constructed in 1845, Adams Mill was one of over two hundred grist mills around the state. Today, only about fifteen remain. Possibly the most notable pre-Civil War industrial enterprise in the state was the Cannelton Cotton Mill in Perry County. The monumental Lombardic Romanesque mill building was located on the north bank of the Ohio River in an effort to establish a textile manufacturing center in the Midwest. Today, its textile operation having ended, the Cannelton mill has been successfully converted to senior housing.

At the beginning of the 20th century, industrial growth drove the development of the Calumet region of northwest Indiana with entire towns, such as Gary and Marktown, owing their existence to establishment of a major industry, such as steel manufacturing or petroleum refining. Both communities were part of a movement to provide model communities for the thousands of workers that flooded into the region to work in the industrial plants. Meanwhile, in the limestone region of the state, quarries like those in the Victor Limestone District in Monroe County and stone cutting mills in Monroe and Lawrence Counties transformed the landscape as Indiana limestone increasingly became a building material of choice around the country during and after the Great Depression.

Transportation routes have played a crucial role in the formation of the state's identity since the first French explorers sought passage between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi delta in the 17th century. Shipping and ship building were vital sources of prosperity for cities like Madison, Jeffersonville, New Albany, and Evansville along the Ohio River and, while most of the wharfs and warehouses in river towns that served riverboat traffic are gone, secondary evidence of the prosperity they generated – mansions, packing houses, storefronts – identify the early importance of the river.

Internal improvements were continually a source of debate nationally in the ante-bellum era, but Indiana's Internal Improvements Act of 1836 embraced the notion that transportation improvements were necessary to the state's economic development. The three canal projects promoted by the Act were of limited economic value because their transportation benefits were soon overtaken by railroads. However, they produced substantial transportation artifacts, including clearly visible sections of canal beds, tow paths, locks, and feeder dams.

The National Road, one of the nation's most significant internal improvement projects, was surveyed and constructed from Richmond through Indianapolis to Terre Haute in the 1830s. Culverts, inns, and sections of the original route have survived to remind us of the Indiana portion of the country's first interstate highway. When the route became part of U.S. 40 in the early 20th century, it prompted the construction of an entirely new generation of road-related resources such as tourist cabins, motels, filling stations, and roadside attractions. The Lincoln Highway did much the same thing at the beginning of the 20th century as it wound its way from coast to coast traversing northern Indiana.

Bridges were an integral part of many historic road-building projects. Unfortunately, only about 90 of Indiana's approximately 600 covered bridges built in the 19th century have survived; however, many of those remaining covered bridges have acquired some level of protection from vandalism and deterioration by new investment and

preservation efforts from owners and local advocacy groups who appreciate the significance and tourism value of these heritage resources. The numbers of various types of historic metal truss bridges also has dwindled from what they were just a few years ago. Concrete bridges, some that were elegant works of engineering, have been lost to modern standards of road safety.

Since pre-historic times, human activity has changed the landscape of Indiana to meet a spectrum of needs. The mounds of Woodland and Mississippian cultures, the distinctive land division of early settlers, the organization of cropland by Hoosier farmers, the extraction of natural resources, and the park and boulevard systems that heighten the urban experience have become the footprint of our presence all across the state. While the Indiana landscape has been and continues to be dynamic, failure to preserve examples of that footprint will leave us with an incomplete picture of our past.

As of late 2012, the broad spectrum of Indiana's cultural resources and significant properties encompassed:

- Over 186,000 identified and documented historic sites and structures;
- Over 61,000 identified and documented archaeological sites, including about 1,000 prehistoric mounds and earthworks;
- Over 10,500 identified cemeteries and burial grounds;
- Over 1,730 listings in the National Register of Historic Places, including more than 365 historic districts;
- 475 Indiana Historical Markers commemorating significant people, events, buildings, structures, and sites;
- 83 historic county courthouses, all listed in the National Register of Historic Places;
- 38 National Historic Landmark properties and districts;
- 24 state parks;
- 14 state forests, and the Hoosier National Forest;
- 11 state-owned and managed historic sites; and,
- 3 units of the National Park Service: the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial.

SURVEYS TO IDENTIFY AND DOCUMENT CULTURAL RESOURCES

In the mid-1970s, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources began awarding matching subgrants using funds from the National Park Service (NPS) for the identification of cultural resources above ground as well as below ground.¹ The Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI) program began in 1976 with the first two counties being systematically surveyed to identify and document buildings and structures 50 years old or older. Between 1978 and 2010, grant-funded surveyors completed an average of three county surveys each year. Along the way, a handful of counties were resurveyed and five cities (all of them designated Certified Local Government communities) also had their own surveys completed.

With very few exceptions, the results of these surveys were published in "Interim Reports." Each of these documents described the resource types and architectural styles commonly found in the county, provided histories for the county and each civil township, town, and identified historic district, and also included maps and a catalog listing of all the resources identified. This growing family of county survey publications, which is available at public libraries and planning agencies all across the state, has been the foundation of efforts to nominate eligible properties and districts to the National Register of Historic Places. All of the original survey records are retained in the files at the DHPA and are used to guide both federal and state environmental review processes. In 2012 after

¹ In 1977, the core staff positions of what is now the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology were created within the former Division of State Museums and Memorials. This expansion consisted of adding an archaeologist, architect, and architectural historian to carry out the functions of the State Historic Preservation Office under the National Historic Preservation Act and new functions given to the Department by state law. The DHPA, in its organizational structure as we know it today, was formally created by state law in 1981.

three and half decades, Indiana achieved the major milestone of having completed a systematic countywide survey of above-ground resources in all 92 counties. “Phase 2” of the IHSSI is now beginning, with counties being resurveyed to update information as well as to document resources that were not yet 50 years old at the time of the original survey.

The DHPA began making subgrants for archaeological surveys and investigations also in the late 1970s. The first small surveys were focused on delineating boundaries and improving our understanding of important known archaeological sites, such as the 18th century French Fort Ouiatenon near present-day Lafayette. By the 1980s, grant-assisted archaeological surveys, most carried out by universities, were covering larger areas and sought to identify and document previously unknown sites. Since the 1990s, most grant-funded archaeology projects have consisted of large-scale surveys – sometimes covering entire watersheds or other multiple-county regions – in order to add sites to the state’s inventory, while a smaller number of projects have focused on investigating important sites to assess eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. On average, more than 1,000 additional archaeological sites are newly documented each year, with many of these being identified through NPS grant-assisted survey projects. Unlike the above-ground survey program that has now covered the entire state, less than 1% of the land in Indiana has been surveyed by professional archaeologists, so there is still much work to be done. Archaeological survey records, maps, and reports are housed at the DHPA and are available for review by qualified professional archaeologists. Like the survey files for above-ground resources, these documents are used to guide both federal and state environmental review processes.

BUILDING A COMPREHENSIVE CULTURAL RESOURCES DATABASE

Over a number of years and utilizing several different software programs, the DHPA had developed a number of electronic data sets of various resources and resource types, but lacked a single unified database. After extensive design planning, construction began in 2005 on a Microsoft SQL® platform database to contain information about all of Indiana’s cultural resources. The initial funding came from the Federal Highway Administration through the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT), and was augmented by the DHPA’s annual Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grants from the National Park Service. This new database, named the State Historic Architecture and Archaeological Resource Database (SHAARD), was first made available to the public in 2007, although it did not contain much data at that time.

As the capability of SHAARD increased, the DHPA took meaningful steps to halt the growth of paper survey record files and to facilitate data entry. In late 2008, the DHPA embarked on a multi-year project to conduct a survey of historic sites and structures in the nine counties that contain the corridor of the Interstate 69 extension from Indianapolis southwest to Evansville. As mitigation for this project, INDOT had provided a significant funding commitment for the DHPA to execute these surveys. This extremely large multi-year project enabled the DHPA to test its new electronic survey methodology. Equipped with digital cameras and tablet PC units with built-in GPS devices, the DHPA’s field surveyors began creating fully electronic survey records that were uploaded directly into SHAARD. Two years later, archaeologists began creating their site survey records in the database as well. The following year, the DHPA made the final step of the complete transition to electronic survey by releasing the software and equipment for use by an outside survey partner organization so that no new paper survey records for any of Indiana’s cultural resources were generated after mid-2011.

Despite the creation of electronic survey records going forward, populating the database continues to be a daunting task as the DHPA holds about 300,000 paper records and reports for all survey types conducted over a span of 35 years. Since 2010, the DHPA has been using sizeable annual State Planning and Research (SPR) matching grants from the Federal Highway Administration and INDOT to systematically populate this database, as well as to implement specific enhancements to improve functionality and searchability.

During recovery efforts from several federally declared storm disasters, the DHPA also received assistance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for the development of SHAARD. FEMA contractors

conducted data entry for sites and structures in several disaster-affected counties. This underscores a less-recognized but extremely important aspect of SHAARD – that it will enable rapid assessment of cultural resources affected by disasters when they strike and appropriate planning for recovery efforts that takes cultural resources into consideration.

Two major milestones were achieved in 2012: all of Indiana’s National Register nominations and photos were uploaded into the database, and SHAARD GIS “went live,” giving public users the ability to see the location of cultural resources on the map for the first time (except that access to archaeology site information is restricted to qualified professional archaeologists in order to protect the sites). By the end of 2012, 25 of 92 Indiana counties had 100% of their above-ground survey records entered in SHAARD, while 30 other counties had 100% of their archaeological survey records entered.

As more cultural resource data is entered and more program enhancements are added, SHAARD is becoming an increasingly useful tool for the preservation and archaeology communities. The availability of the data on-line will reduce the need for cultural resource professionals to visit the DHPA to conduct record checks and it is already streamlining the environmental review process. The development of advanced query tools for both SHAARD and the GIS application, scheduled to be built and completed in 2013, will allow users to design their own queries and retrieve data suited to their own needs. If the funding currently used for SHAARD development remains available at about the same level, the DHPA projects that 100% of all paper survey records, technical reports, and contextual histories will be uploaded into the database by the end of 2018.

WHAT THE CULTURAL RESOURCES DATABASE TELLS US SO FAR

At the time it was analyzed during the planning process, SHAARD contained complete historic sites and structures data for 19 counties – just over one-fifth of the state. That data provides a respectable statistical sample from which the DHPA can make some general observations about Indiana’s above-ground resources:

- Not surprisingly, almost 69% of the sampling’s resources were identified for their architectural significance, and 71% of Indiana’s listings in the National Register claim architecture as an area of significance.
- Indiana has always been predominantly an agricultural state, as evidenced by 10% of identified resources being agriculture-related, and almost 9% of the state’s National Register listings claim agriculture as an area of significance.
- Properties associated with commerce make up nearly 8% of the sample, and reflect the spectrum of resources ranging from small town commercial districts to urban high rises. Nearly 400 of Indiana’s listings in the National Register have commercial significance, representing almost one quarter of the state’s total listings.
- A relatively small percentage of identified resources – just 4% – remain to tell the story of the state’s exploration and early settlement period, indicating a substantial, if not unexpected, loss of heritage resources from the first half of the 19th century. However, 9% of Indiana’s National Register listings cite exploration/early settlement as an area of significance.
- Indiana prides itself on being known as the “Crossroads of America” as a result of the network of road and rail infrastructure that crisscrosses the state. Almost 3% of the properties identified in the sample are associated with transportation, and nearly 14% of the state’s National Register listings have transportation significance.
- A very small number of resources in the sample – just 1% – are related to industry. However, this small sampling number probably reflects the fact that resources from the state’s industrial centers in central and northwest Indiana have not yet been entered into SHAARD.
- Indiana has witnessed several waves of immigration throughout its territorial and statehood history and yet a little over 1% of identified resources are associated with ethnic heritage. However, 5% of the state’s National Register listings cite ethnic heritage as at least one of their areas of significance.

At the time it was analyzed during the planning process, SHAARD contained complete archaeological data for 30 counties – one third of the state; however, partial data also was available for the other 62 counties. The completed counties are grouped together and essentially comprise the southernmost third of the state, as archaeological data entry efforts are proceeding from south to north. Notably, site density tends to be somewhat higher in the south than in the north, so that the collection of counties in this statistical sample actually encompasses about 40% of the recorded sites in the state.² Therefore, this statistical sample is large enough that the DHPA can make some general observations about Indiana's below-ground resources:

- Approximately 80% of all currently known archaeological sites in Indiana are prehistoric and range from isolated artifact finds to major earthwork complexes spanning the range of time from about 10,000 B.C. to roughly A.D. 1650, while approximately 20% of all archaeological sites are historic and range from shipwrecks to clusters of historic artifacts found in farm fields or even urban neighborhoods, and generally date from about A.D. 1650 to 50 years before the current date;
- Indiana's currently known archaeological resources are distributed among cultural periods as follows:
 - About 2% are from the Paleoindian Period, dating roughly from 10,000 to 8,000 B.C.;
 - About 29% are from the Archaic Period, dating roughly from 8,000 to 1,000 B.C.;
 - About 17% are from the Woodland Period, dating roughly from 1,000 B.C. to A.D. 1000;
 - About 3% are Mississippian, dating roughly from A.D. 900 to 1450;
 - About 27% are prehistoric, but not enough information is available to clearly associate them with any particular cultural period;
 - About 20% are historic, dating roughly from A.D. 1650 to 50 years ago;
- Indiana's currently known archaeological resources are distributed by site type as follows:
 - About 26% are lithic scatters, which are distributions of stone artifacts with little to no evidence of habitation at the site;
 - About 18% are camp sites, which are locations showing evidence of short term occupation by prehistoric peoples;
 - About 12% are isolated finds, which are single artifacts found in their original context;
 - About 8% are historic farmsteads or houses, which represent early settlement patterns in Indiana;
 - About 3% are habitation sites, which show evidence of short term or possibly seasonal occupation by prehistoric peoples;
 - About 2% are mounds or earthworks, which were ceremonial or burial structures.
 - About 2% are villages, which are sites having evidence of long term occupation by prehistoric peoples.

A QUICK DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF INDIANA

In 2010, the population of Indiana was 6.48 million people, up from 6.08 million ten years earlier. Indiana's growth rate of 6.6% was stronger than the regional 3.9% growth rate for the Midwest, but less than the national average of 9.7%. Over the last decade, almost one third of Indiana's 92 counties (29) lost population, although population losses were modest in all cases. Of these shrinking counties, 24 have populations under 40,000 and illustrate the trend of stagnant or dwindling populations in many rural areas. The five shrinking counties with larger populations were ones affected by the loss of manufacturing jobs over the last decade. However, 63 Indiana counties grew, and seven of these counties grew at rates of 15% or more. Of these seven fast-growing counties, five of them are contiguous to Marion County and are part of the Indianapolis metropolitan area, and three of these five counties registered growth rates above 25%.

² Because partial data was available for the 62 incomplete counties, it was possible to compare the statistical breakdowns by cultural period and site type from the 30 completed counties against the state as a whole, even though the statewide picture is incomplete. These breakdown statistics were not significantly different, and the small differences observed were expected due to known regional differences from south to north.

The racial composition of the Hoosier population is about 84% white, 9% African American, 6% Hispanic, and less than 1% Native American – roughly comparable to the national average for these groups. Indiana’s population composition has been changing modestly as minority populations grew at faster rates than the white population. Notably, Indiana’s Hispanic population grew at a rate of 82% over the last ten years.

Nearly one quarter of the Hoosier workforce is employed in education, health care, and social assistance occupations, while 19% of workers are engaged in manufacturing and 11% in retail trades. Although Indiana is traditionally recognized as an agricultural state, less than 2% of the workforce is employed in this sector.

Out of nearly 2.8 million housing units, 70% are owner-occupied dwellings – comparable to but slightly higher than the national average. More than one third of these dwellings (37% or about 725,000 units) were constructed before 1960, making them more than 50 years – old enough to be considered historic, depending on significance, condition, and level of integrity.³

ACCOMPLISHMENTS FROM THE PREVIOUS PLANNING CYCLE (2005-2012)

During the previous planning cycle, the DHPA has made significant accomplishments that have advanced preservation activity throughout the state. In most cases, these accomplishments are the result of partnerships with one or more state agencies as well as statewide, regional, and local preservation organizations. Some of the more noteworthy accomplishments from 2005 through 2012 are summarized here by program area:

Survey and Inventory:

- Above-ground surveys were executed in 25 counties (19 with funding from the Historic Preservation Fund and 6 with funding from INDOT), achieving the major milestone of completing initial above-ground surveys for all of Indiana’s 92 counties.
- Electronic survey equipment and methodology was successfully tested and used to complete six of the 25 above-ground county surveys; all new county surveys are being conducted electronically, and no new paper survey records are being produced for above-ground resources.
- All inventory records for archaeology sites identified through grant-assisted surveys as well as cultural resource management projects have been created directly in SHAARD since 2010, and no new paper survey records are being produced for below-ground resources.

National Register:

- An additional 220 Indiana listings were added to the National Register of Historic Places – 147 individual property listings plus 73 districts which all together encompass a total of more than 12,500 contributing resources.
- All of the nomination documents and photos for Indiana’s properties on the National Register of Historic Places – more than 1,700 listings – were scanned and uploaded into SHAARD where they are available to the public on-line.
- The Historic Courthouse Initiative was completed by preparing nominations for the last 17 unlisted historic county courthouses; now all 83 of Indiana’s remaining historic county courthouses are listed in the National Register.
- Three additional historic properties and one very large district were designated by the National Park Service as National Historic Landmarks – the Auburn Cord Duesenberg Automobile Facility in Auburn; Akima Pinšiwá Awiki, the Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House in Fort Wayne; The Republic, a modernist newspaper office and production facility in Columbus; and the Madison Historic District, containing nearly 1,700 contributing resources.

³ All demographic statistics in this section are from the 2010 U.S. Census.

Section 106:

- The State Historic Architecture and Archaeology Database (SHAARD) has gone from the drawing board to reality. Although it is far from complete, it has gained enough critical mass to make it a viable tool, primarily for environmental review processes. Significant achievements include:
 - Completion of data entry for above-ground survey records for 19 complete counties, plus six counties that were surveyed electronically, bringing the total number to 25 counties that have complete above-ground survey records available in the database;
 - Completion of data entry for archaeological survey records for 30 complete counties; nine of those counties also have 100% of their archaeological technical reports scanned and uploaded into the database – a total of nearly 1,500 reports;
 - Completion of the SHAARD GIS application that spatially presents the location and information associated with records in the database. The datasets available include the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures County Survey, cemeteries, historic bridges (wood, stone, metal, and concrete), National Register-listed properties, and archaeology sites. The SHAARD GIS application is already slated for further development and enhancements that will make it more useful to the casual user as well as the serious researcher.

Historic Preservation Fund Grants:

- Successfully administered 212 subgrant and cooperative agreement projects statewide using \$4.5 million of federal pass-through funds, matched by nearly \$4.9 million of non-federal funds. This combined investment of \$9.4 million spread over eight years – nearly \$1.2 million per year – achieved the following notable results:
 - Completion of 60 rehabilitation projects at important historic buildings around the state;
 - Preparation of 51 nominations that added 6,748 Hoosier properties to the National Register of Historic Places;
 - Completion of 36 archaeology projects that identified and documented 1,586 sites and conducted 49 investigations of significant sites;
 - Hosting of 28 cemetery preservation training workshops that were attended by more than 800 cemetery advocates, genealogists, DNR staff, and interested individuals;
 - Preparation of 21 historic structure reports for state-owned historic sites;
 - Completion of 19 countywide surveys that identified and documented nearly 30,000 above-ground resources;
 - Co-sponsorship of seven statewide historic preservation conferences that were attended by more than 950 professional preservationists and archaeologists, educators, students, local preservation advocates, elected officials, and interested members of the general public.
- The DHPA maintained an average annual pass-through of more than \$550,000 per year for subgrants and cooperative agreements, despite the national recession and the resulting reduction of the DHPA's state operating budget.

Rehabilitation Tax Credits:

- The DHPA certified 62 federal Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credit projects in 25 different communities. Total qualified rehabilitation costs exceeded \$306 million of investment. This cumulative private investment leveraged 20% federal tax credits of more than \$61 million. Although two projects together – rehabilitation of the West Baden Springs Hotel (NHL) and the nearby French Lick Hotel – represented nearly two-thirds of the total qualified costs statewide, all of these tax credit projects illustrate significant economic impacts in the communities where they occurred.
- The DHPA certified state Residential Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits that assisted projects at 90 owner-occupied residences in 32 different communities. Total qualified rehabilitation costs exceeded \$7 million of investment by homeowners. This cumulative private investment leveraged 20% state tax credits of more than \$1.4 million. All of these tax credit projects illustrate improvements to historic neighborhoods and significant economic impacts in the communities where they occurred.

Certified Local Government Program:

- Four additional Indiana communities were designated as Certified Local Governments – Lafayette, Madison, New Albany, and Newburgh – bringing the statewide total to 19.
- The DHPA hosted five Commission Assistance and Mentoring Program (CAMP) events led by trainers from the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions in the CLG communities of Crown Point, Elkhart, Muncie, New Albany, and Newburgh, attended by a total of 130 members and staff of local historic preservation commissions.
- The DHPA provided a total of 40 scholarships for members and staff of CLG preservation commissions to attend the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions' bi-annual Forum events in 2008, 2010, and 2012.

Other:

- The DHPA provided staff support to the Indiana Courthouse Preservation Advisory Commission in its charge from the Indiana General Assembly to compile information on the condition of historic county courthouses, the needs of county officials for maintaining their courthouses, and recommendations for the preservation and rehabilitation of the state's 83 historic county courthouses. The resulting report provides guidance for county officials in making preservation-focused decisions regarding upkeep and continued use of these iconic buildings, for possible legislation to support such efforts by county officials, and for technical assistance and educational initiatives by the DHPA and others.
- The DHPA assisted with setting up the Archeology Preservation Trust Fund established under state law, which allows the Division to conduct a program to assist private homeowners who have accidentally discovered an artifact, burial object, or human remains, and who need assistance to comply with an approved plan to excavate or secure the site from further disturbance. Members of the public may voluntarily donate to the Fund.
- Since 2009, the DHPA has produced at least one volume annually of the journal *Indiana Archaeology*. Under the DHPA's state statute, one of the duties of the division is to develop a program of archaeological research and development, including publication of information about archaeological resources in the state. The journal volumes are available on-line from the DHPA's website.
- DHPA staff had contact with a combined audience of more than 34,000 individuals through its tracked public outreach efforts, including more than 850 presentations, consultations, booths and tables at heritage events, trolley tours at the Indiana State Fair, and a variety of other venues. Topics included cemetery preservation, the Underground Railroad in Indiana, archaeology, historic architecture, state and federal rehabilitation tax credit programs, the Historic Preservation Fund matching grant program, the National Register of Historic Places, and more.

CHAPTER 3: THE PLANNING PROCESS

DEVELOPING A STATEWIDE SURVEY

During preparation of Indiana's first *Cultural Resources Management Plan* (1998) and the first plan revision (2005), on-line survey tools either were non-existent or were not readily accessible for use by the general public. Therefore, public meetings around the state were used as the method to gather feedback from Hoosiers about the importance of preservation, endangered resource types, and public needs for programs and assistance. However, these public meetings proved to have a number of drawbacks, namely the difficulty of coordinating and promoting these regional events, the time and expense for staff travel to evening meetings across the state, relatively low turn-out figures, and public input that was not always comparable from one meeting to the next. By the time Indiana's last plan cycle was nearing its end, on-line survey tools were commonplace and many other state historic preservation offices already had used them successfully for gathering public input.

In early 2011, DHPA staff started the public input process by reviewing the on-line surveys then in use by 18 other state historic preservation offices.⁴ The wide variety of survey questions sparked lively conversations about what the DHPA wanted to learn from the public, what information would be interesting versus what information would be the most relevant, the importance of providing carefully selected answer options, and the appropriate length of the survey.

DHPA staff developed a check-box survey of 17 questions, with five of those questions containing multiple parts. Where appropriate, several questions allowed for a brief narrative response in a text box following an answer option of "Other." The survey ended with an opportunity for people to give a final narrative response of any additional thoughts, ideas, and suggestions for preserving Indiana's heritage. The survey was intended to take the average person about 20 to 25 minutes to complete. The survey questions and answer options are reproduced in Appendix A.

The survey questions were designed to address four main themes:

- How do survey participants identify themselves and where do they live?
- What is the current preservation context and climate in Indiana?
- What is the level of public awareness of various preservation activities at both the state and local levels?
- How does the public assess the current relevance of the plan goals from 2005?

PROMOTING THE STATEWIDE SURVEY

To give the public adequate time to participate, the DHPA staff selected a five-month window for the survey during 2011. This period opened at the beginning of *Indiana Preservation Month* (May) and ran through the end of *Indiana Archaeology Month* (September). Promotional communications for both of Indiana's month-long heritage celebrations invited Hoosiers to take the survey.

Efforts to promote the DHPA's first on-line survey ran the gamut from traditional methods to new social media and spanned the full five-month period. An initial press release generated several interviews with news outlets. DHPA staff announced or presented information about the survey at more than 30 different public events around the state, ranging from public archaeology programs to events at the Indiana State Fair to meetings of local historical

⁴ The states that were slightly ahead of Indiana in their planning cycle and had public input surveys on their websites included: Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.

and genealogical societies and other groups. Handouts at these events directed people to the on-line survey, but hard-copy surveys were also made available for people without access to the Internet. In contrast to these traditional news outlets and face-to-face contacts at public events, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources also promoted the survey on its own Facebook page.

Most promotional communications were conducted by e-mail and other electronic formats. All messages contained an active link to the survey and also asked recipients to help promote the survey by encouraging others to participate. E-mail announcements were sent to individuals known to be interested in preservation, as well as traditional partner organizations such as avocational archaeology groups, county and local historical societies and museums, county historians, Indiana Landmarks and its Affiliate Council members, Indiana Main Street communities, Indiana's 18 Certified Local Governments, local preservation organizations, and university programs in archaeology, landscape architecture, preservation, and public history. The survey was promoted among all state employees, especially those working throughout Indiana for the Department of Natural Resources, the Indiana State Museum and Historic Sites, and several other heritage-related agencies. The DHPA advertised the survey through its own electronic newsletters and managed listservs reaching a handful of different audiences and also placed announcements in the e-newsletters of other heritage-related organizations.⁵

Finally, the DHPA contacted a number of local, regional, and statewide organizations to enlist their help in advertising the on-line survey among their memberships. To encourage participation from local government officials, the DHPA promoted the survey among the Association of Indiana Counties, the Indiana Association of Cities and Town, and the Indiana Township Association. To reach out to professionals, the survey was promoted among the Indiana Chapters of the American Institute of Architects, the American Institute of Certified Planners, and the American Society of Landscape Architects. To insure participation by various planning interests, the DHPA contacted the Indiana Association of City Engineers, the Indiana Association of County Highway Engineers, the Indiana Division of the Federal Highway Administration, the Local Technical Assistance Program staff at Purdue University, and regional and metropolitan planning commissions throughout the state.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

Because this was the DHPA's first on-line survey, staff did not have any past experience to suggest how many people might respond. Nevertheless, the DHPA set three progressive goals for public participation. The first goal was for every one of Indiana's 92 counties to be represented by at least one survey response. The second goal was for each county to have more than five responses. The third goal was for each county to have more than ten responses. Achieving one or more of these goals would indicate a good level of statewide participation and help insure that any regional issues and concerns would be adequately reflected in the survey data.

The on-line survey program allowed the survey host to get a snapshot of the data at any time. Just over half-way through the five-month period and part-way through the planned and on-going outreach and promotion efforts, fewer than 300 people had taken the survey and 38 counties had no responses at all. The DHPA staff realized that its initial efforts to promote the survey had been less effective than they were expected to be. Therefore, the on-going promotional efforts continued as planned, but staff began to develop strategies specifically for boosting participation levels in the unrepresented and under-represented counties.

To attempt to achieve the first goal of having all 92 counties represented, e-mail invitations to take the survey were sent to the county historians, local historical societies, local museums, and local preservation organizations in

⁵ The DHPA's two e-newsletters target preservationists and archaeologists and the DHPA's two managed listservs cover the topics of cemetery preservation and the Underground Railroad. Other organizational e-newsletters that promoted the DHPA's survey included "Communique On-Line" (Indiana Historical Society), "GENI" (geography and social studies educators), "H-Net" (history professionals), and "Wednesday Word" (local librarians).

the 38 unrepresented counties. These efforts proved to be highly successful when, just three weeks later, the number of unrepresented counties had dropped from 38 to just 3. During this same three-week period, momentum began to build behind the survey as the total number of survey responses statewide more than quadrupled – increasing by nearly 1,000.

To attempt to meet the second and third goals, counties with 10 or fewer responses were targeted one at a time. Staff conducted Internet searches to look for ten to twenty e-mail addresses for the types of people who should be found in every county, such as mayors, town managers, clerk-treasurers, city planners and other key local government staff, county commissioners, economic development corporation staff, community foundation staff, public library directors and staff, county historians and genealogists, and local historical society organizations and museums. Tailored e-mail messages indicated how many people statewide had taken the survey, but how few people from their county had participated. Besides the active link to the on-line survey, these messages contained an urgent plea for help spreading the word about the survey among others in their organizations and throughout their communities. A total of 55 of Indiana's 92 counties (60%) were targeted this way. These focused efforts demanded a great deal of time, but proved to be highly successful.⁶

At the end of five months' worth of intensive promotional efforts, a total of 3,813 people had taken the survey and all 92 counties were represented. An average of 40 people per county participated in the survey.⁷ Two percent of all survey responses were submitted on paper forms by people without Internet access. In the end, the DHPA came very close to achieving its third and highest goal of having more than ten responses from each county. Only five of 92 counties fell into the range of six to ten responses. A statistical overview of the survey response data is contained in [Appendix B](#).

THE STATEWIDE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To help gain a broader perspective on Indiana's preservation issues and concerns, the DHPA once again formed a Statewide Plan Advisory Committee, just as it had done for preparation of the 1998 and 2005 plans. DHPA staff first developed a list containing 45 positions, each representing a type of agency, organization, profession, or other interest that would be beneficial to have on this committee. Next, specific individuals were nominated by staff to fill these positions, with careful attention paid to where these individuals lived so that broad geographic representation was also achieved. In the end, 33 individuals accepted the invitation to serve.⁸ They represented state and federal⁹ government agencies, the State legislature, municipalities, statewide organizations, universities,

⁶ DHPA staff monitored the county-by-county response rates at each of four data review intervals, and kept careful records of all efforts to boost survey results in the under-represented counties. The intervals were consistently 2-3 weeks apart. During the four intervals, staff sent a total of 955 e-mails within the 55 targeted counties (several counties were targeted twice). The average gain in the number of survey responses in non-targeted counties was just 3 per review interval. However, the average gain in the number of survey responses in targeted counties was 23 per review interval. Therefore, the data suggests that the efforts to boost survey responses in a targeted county had the net impact of leveraging an average of 20 additional responses per county. The DHPA believes that these efforts to broaden participation among the targeted counties had the cumulative effect of adding more than 1,300 survey responses.

⁷ This computation excludes the small number of people (75) who indicated that they lived outside Indiana as well as the small number of people (42) who did not indicate their county of residence.

⁸ The names and organization affiliations of these 33 individuals are listed at the beginning of this document.

⁹ Two members of the Statewide Plan Advisory Committee represented federal agencies: a unit of the National Park Service in Indiana, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development. A representative of a third federal agency was invited, but declined to participate on the committee. In addition, the professional staff members of the Indiana Division of the Federal Highway Administration were contacted by e-mail to invite their participation in the public input survey.

grassroots groups, professions, and a variety of special interests, and also hailed from 18 different counties across the state. More than half of the committee members also met federal qualifications for educational background in preservation-related disciplines under 36 CFR 61.

To limit the time commitment from committee members, their duties were carefully defined. First, they were asked to take the survey and then promote it among their colleagues and throughout their own communities. After the survey data was compiled, they attended a presentation in Indianapolis to see how the public responded. This meeting afforded members the chance to discuss the survey results from their different perspectives, assess the current relevance of the goal statements from 2005, and give guidance about how the new goals should be shaped. Once the new goal statements were drafted, the committee members were given a chance to review them, offer final suggestions, and endorse the direction of the new plan.

CHAPTER 4: A PLAN FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN INDIANA

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Through the day-to-day administration of Indiana's historic preservation programs, the DHPA staff has identified a number of challenges and threats to the state's cultural resources. Many of these challenges exist in all states, such as the lingering effects of the national recession that began in late 2007, while other challenges are more specific to the Midwest or are peculiar to just a few Hoosier communities. Some challenges have existed for decades, while others are quite recent. Most if not all of these challenges are corroborated by the data and/or narrative comments received through the public input survey.

- The far-reaching impact of the recession has resulted in closures of businesses and manufacturing plants, leading to high rates of unemployment. In some of the hardest-hit communities, lack of funds for upkeep of properties as well as bank foreclosures have become epidemic.
- In some communities, large historic homes in very desirable locations are being demolished to make way for even larger "mansions." Sometimes two adjacent homes are demolished to be replaced by one new home.
- Preservation advocates continue to face opposition in some communities to the creation of new locally designated historic districts by owners who do not want any restrictions placed on their ability to alter or demolish their properties.
- In the last few years, several Indiana communities with local preservation ordinances have faced serious legal challenges as some new property owners in established local historic districts have asked that their properties be "undesignated" so they are not subject to local design review.
- Many communities continue to struggle with the problem of absentee landlords that do not adequately maintain their rental properties, often leading to demolition by neglect.
- The spread of cell towers continues to have an impact on communities and rural viewsheds. Similar to this is a new phenomena in rural parts of northwestern Indiana – the construction of massive "wind farms" that are dramatically transforming the appearance of the landscape.
- The extension of Interstate 69 from Indianapolis to Evansville is having an impact on the cities, towns, and rural areas within the corridor that extends throughout eight counties and into a ninth county. Impacts on cultural resources include demolition of several historic properties, alteration of some rural landscape viewsheds, and destruction of archaeological resources in several locations. Over time, new development will alter some landscapes surrounding interchanges.
- During the recession, declining tax revenue for state, county, and local governments have led to staff reductions and program cutbacks in order to maintain essential public services. Like many other valuable programs and services, local preservation programs have felt this pinch.
- Many of Indiana's historic courthouses face challenges of deferred maintenance and limited funding for needed rehabilitation activities.
- Rising energy costs and increased marketing by home improvement companies is spurring both the visual and actual loss of original historic fabric, as many homeowners are convinced they need to install synthetic siding and replace their windows and doors.
- Many Hoosiers believe that preservation represents an added expense to any project and do not recognize preservation's potential as a valid economic development strategy.
- The Indiana population continues to shift from rural to urban areas, leaving many communities and small towns with vacant buildings that have few prospects for new uses or even continued upkeep.
- Finally, Indiana's listings in the National Register of Historic Places for archaeological sites represent a disproportionately small number when compared to the number of listings for above-ground resources. Currently fewer than 50 out of more than 61,000 known archaeological sites are listed, making up less than 3% of all National Register listings for Indiana.

There are also a number of opportunities to promote and advance preservation in Indiana. Some of these opportunities are unique to the Hoosier state.

- New technology is rapidly changing the way people communicate and receive information. The printed newsletters of a decade ago only reached a tiny fraction of the population. E-mail, websites, blogs, and social media represent new ways to reach ever greater segments of the population. The preservation community can spread its message better, faster, and more cost-effectively than ever before.
- New technology has also changed the way state historic preservation offices maintain, retrieve, update, and share cultural resource data. The DHPA's new electronic database and its GIS layer not only streamline the way SHPO staff access information for routine duties, but they also make an unprecedented amount of information available to the public through the Internet.
- Both state and federal funding through the Indiana Department of Transportation have helped the DHPA design, build, and populate its cultural resources database, bringing SHAARD's future completion date years closer than the DHPA could have achieved without this significant financial support.
- In coordination with many agencies and stakeholders, including the DHPA, INDOT has developed a program for managing Indiana's publicly owned bridges that are National Register-eligible or listed. A comprehensive inventory determined that approximately 800 structures fall into this category. These wood, stone, metal, and concrete bridges have been prioritized by historic importance and their suitability for preservation. Approximately 55% of these bridges have been classified as "Select," meaning that the bridge is an excellent or rare example of a given type and is highly suitable for preservation. The Federal Highway Administration will not participate in a project that would result in the demolition of a "Select" bridge. If rehabilitation alternatives are not feasible and prudent for a "Non-Select" bridge, an owner must market it for re-use elsewhere before demolition occurs.
- Indiana is served by the largest statewide non-profit preservation organization in the nation. Indiana Landmarks (formerly known as Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana) has a statewide headquarters and eight regional offices that serve individuals and affiliated preservation groups across the state. This organization advocates for and promotes local preservation efforts and activities, provides staff and/or technical support for many local preservation commissions, partners with the DHPA on a number of projects, and routinely directs organizations and individuals to the DHPA's various preservation programs.
- Using its annual Historic Preservation Fund grant from the National Park Service, Indiana has traditionally had one of the strongest pass-through subgrant programs in the country. In the 10 years from 2001 to 2010, an average pass-through of more than \$550,000 per year achieved the following results: 27 county surveys that identified and documented nearly 47,000 above-ground resources; 83 archaeological surveys and investigations that identified and documented nearly 1,400 below-ground resources; 57 listings that added nearly 9,000 Indiana resources to the National Register of Historic Places; 80 rehabilitation projects at National Register-listed buildings across the state; and 89 different preservation education events, programs, and publications. This program continues to build awareness and support for preservation throughout Indiana.
- In 2010, the DHPA received a sizeable Preserve America grant from the National Park Service to compile all available information about Indiana's prehistoric mounds and earthworks. Archaeology partners are currently consulting a wide variety of sources to gather this information for an estimated 1,000 resources. When completed in 2014, this project's findings are expected to guide future research, National Register nominations, and heritage tourism efforts.
- The current 150th anniversary of the Civil War from 2011-2015 and the upcoming state bicentennial in 2016 represent opportunities to boost awareness of and appreciation for Indiana's heritage, cultural resources, and preservation efforts.

WHAT THE PUBLIC TOLD US THROUGH THE SURVEY

About the survey participants:

A broad spectrum of Hoosiers participated in the on-line survey. Nearly one quarter of all survey participants identified themselves first and foremost as "Citizen interested in Indiana's heritage." The next largest category

was government employee at any level (16%). Other categories completing the top ten were: member or staff of not-for-profit organizations, local historical societies, libraries, museums, and arts organizations, educators at all levels, owners of historic properties, elected officials at all levels, history enthusiasts, and finally professional architects, engineers, and planners. Together, these top ten of 25 categories encompassed 82% of the more than 3,800 people who took the survey. All 92 counties are represented in the survey data. The smallest number of responses from any county was seven, while five counties each had more than 100 responses. Statewide, the average number of survey responses per county was 40. This geographically diverse and broad cross-section of the public provided the feedback that is summarized, quantified, and interpreted below.

The current preservation context and climate in Indiana:

To learn why the public believes that preservation is important, the survey posed this question with ten answer options. Pairs of answer options suggested five different “reasons” why preservation is important: economic benefits, educational benefits, environmental benefits, livability and quality of life benefits, and finally intangible benefits, such as leaving a legacy for future generations and showing respect for ancestors. Analysis of the data shows that the levels of public support for the top three reasons were extremely close to each other, but could be ranked as follows: first – intangible benefits, second – educational benefits, and third – livability and quality of life benefits. Notably, the public very clearly ranked economic benefits much lower than the top three reasons, but ranked environmental benefits lowest of all. This suggests that Hoosiers do not recognize and/or do not appreciate that preservation has economic as well as environmental benefits.

When considering the overall level of public support and appreciation for preservation, survey-takers had a slightly more favorable impression of their own communities than they did for the state as a whole. In response to the statement “My community or county appreciates its own cultural resources and historic preservation and archaeology activities,” the bulk of responses (69%) indicated answer options agree or somewhat agree, and were exactly split between the two. The combined favorable answer options (strongly agree + agree + somewhat agree) registered 82% of responses, whereas the combined unfavorable options (somewhat disagree + disagree + strongly disagree) registered just 14%.

In response to the statement “Hoosiers throughout the state appreciate Indiana’s cultural resources and historic preservation and archaeology activities,” a slightly greater share of responses (72%) indicated answer options agree or somewhat agree, but leaned slightly more towards somewhat agree than the previous question did. The combined favorable answer options (strongly agree + agree + somewhat agree) registered a slightly smaller share of responses at 77%, but the combined unfavorable options (somewhat disagree + disagree + strongly disagree) remained the same at 14%. Overall, the level of public support and appreciation for preservation as shown by the survey data was encouraging, but there is plenty of room for improvement if support for preservation is to become a truly mainstream Hoosier value.

When asked to consider the most threatened cultural resources at the local level, four of the top seven resource types selected by survey-takers were ones traditionally recognized as endangered. The highest-ranked answer option was historic downtowns and commercial areas, which reinforces the continuing relevance of Goal #2 from 2005 that addressed this exact issue. Notably, the second and third ranked answer options were relative newcomers to the list of endangered resource types during the last planning cycle: rural and historic landscapes, and cemeteries and burial grounds. Over the last decade, the DHPA has built a statewide registry of historic cemeteries, co-hosted dozens of formal training events for local cemetery advocates, and worked with different communities to study and document historic landscapes and nominate them to the National Register. Therefore, the high ranking of these two resource types suggests that the DHPA's preservation efforts have had the effect of helping raise public awareness of cemeteries and landscapes as important resources – and threatened ones. The next most endangered resource types were historic neighborhoods, historic bridges, historic schools, and historic agricultural buildings and resources. Among these four, historic schools was the third relative newcomer to the list of endangered resource types as school districts statewide over the last decade have increasingly needed to adapt their historic buildings to new standards for classroom sizes, accessibility, and modern technology.

Next, the survey asked participants to consider from a statewide perspective what classes of resources were the least appreciated in Hoosiers' knowledge and understanding of the past. The top two answer options came out exactly tied: Native American resources, and community infrastructure resources – things such as water towers, brick streets, and stone sidewalks and curbs. The next three answer options were not tied, but had very similar numbers of responses: landscapes and recreational resources, mid-twentieth century resources, and African American resources.

Survey participants were asked to consider and rank the most serious threats to Indiana's heritage resources, both now and over the next 10 years. In both the present and future versions of the question, the top six of 11 answer options were the same and reflected about 80% of the responses. Differences in the ranked order of the top six answer options from the present to the future were insignificant. According to survey-takers, the one threat that stood out above all others was lack of funding, both public and private. The other top responses were ranked as follows: owner neglect and disinvestment; lack of awareness and/or lack of understanding of the value and fragility of heritage resources; development pressure, tear-downs, and sprawl; apathy; and big box superstores driving out local businesses.

When asked what issues should be the top priorities for the statewide preservation community to address over the next 10 years, clear preference was given to the top five of eight answer options, which reflected 80% of all responses. Survey-takers indicated that the top priority should be education of the general public about the importance of preserving heritage resources, while the next priority should be education of decision-makers and others who influence the fate of the built environment as well as land containing archaeological resources. Together, these two education-focused priorities underscore the enduring relevance of Goal #1 from 2005 that addressed these exact issues. The other top priorities were: community and/or neighborhood revitalization planning and implementation; direct investment to save endangered resources; and advocacy and/or lobbying for preservation legislation and funding.

To finalize the preservation context section of the survey, participants were asked what training, information, or education topics would be most helpful to them and their communities. Again, one answer option stood out above the rest – financial incentives for preservation and archaeology. The second-highest ranked answer option was energy efficiency and weatherization in historic buildings, and suggests the opportunity to link preservation with conservation in the public's mind. The other top responses were training for local preservation commissions, training on laws protecting resources, and proper methods for rehabilitation of historic masonry or woodwork.

Public awareness of preservation:

This section of the survey gauged whether citizens were aware of preservation efforts and programs, both at the state and local levels. More than two-thirds of survey-takers knew that the DHPA was involved with listing properties in the National Register of Historic Places, maintaining a statewide registry of historic cemeteries, monitoring all archaeological activity in the state, maintaining a statewide database of cultural resources, and reviewing federal projects for their effects on Indiana's cultural resources. More than half of survey-takers knew that the DHPA conducts surveys to identify historic properties and archaeology sites, provides educators with heritage-related materials, and manages a competitive matching grant program for certain preservation and archaeology activities. However, the DHPA needs to increase its efforts to build public awareness of tax credit programs as financial incentive tools, the division's website and e-newsletter as sources of information, and its annual statewide preservation conference as an important educational and networking opportunity.

Regarding awareness of preservation-related programs, institutions, and efforts at the local level, survey-takers indicated a very high level of awareness of local historical societies and museums, and local economic development, community development, and main street organizations. The survey showed a lower but still respectable level of public awareness for the county historian program, local preservation commissions, and local non-profit preservation organizations. However, survey-takers registered relatively low levels of awareness for regional and statewide preservation organizations, local cemetery preservation committees or commissions, and avocational archaeology groups.

Current relevance of the plan goals from 2005:

As for Goal #1 from 2005 – ***Increase public understanding and support for historic preservation and archaeology*** – survey-takers indicated that although some amount of progress had been made, efforts to meet this goal must continue. Nearly two-thirds (65%) indicated that it remains a highly relevant goal for the preservation community to pursue under the new state plan. However, when the responses for still relevant are added to those for highly relevant, the result was that 96% of survey-takers felt this goal remained important. Analysis of the survey data, especially the narrative responses, shows that the public identifies three different aspects of preservation education: efforts to educate children and youth, efforts to educate the general public, and efforts to educate elected officials and decision-makers.

As for Goal #2 from 2005 – ***Reverse the decline of main streets and downtown commercial areas*** – survey-takers indicated that although some amount of progress had been made, efforts to meet this goal must continue. Nearly two-thirds (65%) indicated that it remains a highly relevant goal for the preservation community to pursue under the new state plan. However, when the responses for still relevant are added to those for highly relevant, the result was that 95% of survey-takers felt this goal remained important. In contrast, however, the Statewide Plan Advisory Committee felt that the urban/downtown focus was too narrow for a plan that also should address preservation of neighborhoods, small towns, and rural areas.

As for Goal #3 from 2005 – ***Strengthen preservation efforts for non-traditional resource types*** – exactly half of survey-takers were about evenly divided in their indication that some to not much progress had been made, and that efforts to meet this goal should continue and increase. Notably, just over one-third (36%) indicated that they didn't know how much progress had been made, suggesting perhaps that many survey-takers didn't understand what was meant by non-traditional resources. This seems to be corroborated by the Statewide Plan Advisory Committee's feeling that "non-traditional" was a loaded term and could mean different things to different people, and that it may not be totally understood by the public within a preservation context. Nevertheless, a combined 80% of survey-takers indicated that this goal remained either highly relevant or still relevant.

As for Goal #4 from 2005 – ***Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions*** – nearly half (47%) of survey-takers were about evenly divided in their indication that some to not much progress had been made, and that efforts to meet this goal should continue and increase. Notably, a significant segment (41%) indicated that they didn't know how much progress had been made, suggesting that partnerships and coordinated efforts where the DHPA is involved may be poorly recognized by the public. Nevertheless, a combined 84% of survey-takers indicated that this goal remained either highly relevant or still relevant. However, the DHPA staff felt that a more appropriate direction for this goal would be to emphasize interaction among all entities at all levels, as opposed to just the DHPA and one or more other entities.

As for Goal #5 from 2005 – ***Increase cultural and ethnic diversity in the preservation movement*** – a little less than half (45%) of survey-takers were evenly split in their indication that some to not much progress had been made, and that efforts to meet this goal should continue and increase. Notably, a significant segment (39%) indicated that they didn't know how much progress had been made, suggesting that these efforts may be largely unrecognized by the public. Nevertheless, a combined 75% of survey-takers indicated that this goal remained either highly relevant or still relevant. The Statewide Plan Advisory Committee suggested that a more appropriate direction for this goal would be to broaden the preservation movement by being more inclusive of all special interests, stakeholders, and preservation-related groups, without limiting the focus to cultural and ethnic groups.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND STRATEGIES

The following goals are for all heritage stakeholders in Indiana. They are not just a vision or workplan for the state historic preservation office. They should be a guide for all Hoosiers who care about Indiana's history, heritage, communities, environment, and future.

Plan Structure

Indiana's plan for cultural resource management is composed of goals, objectives, and strategies:

- **Goals** are very broad statements that address identified opportunities, challenges, and needs for preservation activity. Incremental progress can be made toward achieving goals, but the goals themselves may never be totally accomplished and could remain high priorities from one multi-year planning cycle to the next. The four goals below reflect the major themes and priorities that were identified through the planning process in 2011-2012. Each goal is followed by a brief introduction to help orient the reader by providing some context or clarification of the goal statement.
- **Objectives** are narrower statements that give structure to the plan by organizing ideas for types of actions and activities that will help achieve the goals. Each goal is supported by two or three related objectives that make a logical progression from one to the next – the first objective suggests initial steps to be taken, the second objective builds upon the first and suggests the next steps to be taken, etc.
- **Strategies** are more narrowly focused statements that give ideas for specific actions that can be carried out by the DHPA Staff, preservation partners, and the general public, working alone or in collaboration with others. Each strategy is worded broadly enough so that it can encompass accomplishments by many different partners through many different activities. This approach avoids the potential pitfall that the plan lists and implies endorsement of a few activities, but ignores many others that may be just as valid or important.

The Emphasis on "Community"

The word community appears throughout the goals, objectives, and strategies. However, readers are asked not to limit the definition to the boundaries of their own city or town. As used here, the term community is intended to convey any logical grouping of Hoosiers at any scale. At the large end of the spectrum, a community can be a county, several neighboring and similar counties, a region, or even the state as a whole. In the middle of the size spectrum are civil townships, cities, and towns. At the small end of the spectrum, a community can be an unincorporated or rural area, a neighborhood, a historic district, an ethnic or religious group, a special interest group, a profession or occupation, or any association of like-minded individuals.

Questions at the end of each goal section invite the reader to focus on the objectives and strategies from the perspective of the multiple "communities" to which they belong. Considering the plan ideas from different vantage points should suggest multiple ways that any one person could participate in the preservation of Indiana's heritage resources.

Measuring Success

How will we measure success? Repetitive and incremental action by a variety of partners is the key. Successes will come when multiple groups undertake repeated activities to accomplish a strategy. The accomplishment of multiple strategies will help achieve an objective. The achievement of one or more objectives will demonstrate progress toward meeting a preservation goal. The future use of on-line surveys will enable the DHPA to assess statewide progress by comparing to a baseline established in the 2011 public input survey.

GOAL 1: Increase public awareness, public understanding, and public support for preservation and archaeology.

A favorable environment for preservation and archaeological activity in Indiana must be built on a foundation of broad public support. First and foremost, all Hoosiers must be aware of the presence of cultural resources around them and the rich heritage that these resources represent. Next, Hoosiers must understand the importance and fragility of these irreplaceable resources and how preserving them not only can teach us about the past, but also can create jobs, conserve energy, make communities more livable places, conserve limited public funds, and generate revenue. In addition to educating the general public on these points, the preservation and archaeology communities also must make specific efforts to educate the younger generations as well as lawmakers and community decision-makers in order to cultivate broad-based support.

Objective A: Increase public awareness through varied efforts, media, and programs aimed at all Hoosiers.

1. Encourage preservationists and archaeologists to explain who they are and what they do.
2. Broaden the general public's recognition of the wide spectrum of all cultural resources.
3. Develop ways to increase awareness of Indiana's cultural resources among youth and children.
4. Assist educators in developing lesson plans and school programs that incorporate preservation and archaeology.
5. Use varied media and technology to disseminate information about the presence and importance of cultural resources.

Objective B: Increase public understanding of Indiana's cultural resources and our statewide heritage.

1. Define what historic and cultural resources are and explain how they are identified.
2. Articulate the importance of historical and cultural resources.
3. Use cultural resources to tell the story of Indiana's past.

Objective C: Increase public support for heritage preservation by marketing its benefits.

1. Explain to the general public the many benefits of preservation to generate support in Indiana's communities.
2. Teach the younger generations how preserving Indiana's cultural resources makes their community a better place.
3. Demonstrate to decision-makers how preservation and its benefits can improve their communities.
4. Build support among the broad range of stakeholders to advocate for preservation of cultural resources.

What opportunities exist to increase public awareness of preservation and archaeology in your community?

Who makes up the audiences that need to be reached? Who is already positioned to reach those audiences?

Which local cultural resources could help you increase public understanding of Hoosier heritage?

Why are cultural resources important to you? Why should they be important to others in your community?

Which of the many benefits of preservation might be most important to your community?

GOAL 2: Broaden the preservation and archaeology communities.

After increasing public awareness, understanding, and support for preservation, the next logical step is to draw new people and groups into the preservation and archaeology communities by helping them identify as stakeholders in our state's long and rich cultural heritage.

Far more people than just preservationists and archaeologists have a stake in Indiana's heritage and cultural resources. Heritage tourists seek experiences that can't be duplicated in other places, while many businesspeople and hospitality workers depend on the dollars these visitors bring to their communities. Nature advocates, environmentalists, and outdoor enthusiasts share a conservation ethic with preservationists. Historians, genealogists, and researchers rely on historic records and documents, but they also learn from the buildings, structures, and sites that tell us about the past. Many developers, realtors, and contractors derive some portion of their livelihoods from the historic buildings in their communities. All across Indiana, people reside in historic housing and neighborhoods, children attend historic schools, and employees work in historic buildings. The preservation movement needs to be as broad and inclusive as possible if preservation is to become a mainstream Hoosier value.

Objective A: Build relationships among people and groups with similar or complementary purposes.

1. Increase communication and collaboration between preservation partners at all levels.
2. Strengthen relationships between cultural resource advocates, preservation commissions, and not-for-profit organizations.
3. Cultivate relationships with local government officials and professionals who deal with community revitalization.
4. Promote and participate in local, regional, statewide, and national events and education opportunities that focus on cultural resources.

Objective B: Identify new partners and develop opportunities for collaboration.

1. Be inclusive of all people interested in preservation and archaeology.
2. Reach out to conservation, recreation, and nature advocates and partner with them on shared issues, goals, and values.
3. Share information about funding sources that can be useful for preservation and archaeology projects.
4. Develop relationships with educators as well as teacher education programs to promote the use of cultural resources within lesson plans.
5. Use existing or develop new materials and programs to give interested parties the knowledge and tools to undertake heritage-related projects.

Where is there overlap between the concerns of preservationists, archaeologists, and other groups or interests?

Who could benefit from receiving information about heritage preservation?

What people or groups may have been overlooked in the past as potential partners?

What opportunities for collaboration may exist in your community?

Who are the key people, groups, or agencies that should be heritage allies in your community? How can you help them become heritage allies?

GOAL 3: Advocate for preservation opportunities and options for all community, cultural, and heritage resources.

Historic resources can provide communities with a variety of opportunities, such as options to create residential, commercial, and work spaces, to develop revenue streams, and to save money by reusing what exists and has already been paid for. Existing laws should be consistently enforced by appropriate government agencies in order to protect cultural resources. When historic properties are damaged or destroyed, communities lose valuable opportunities. Local residents and stakeholders in cultural heritage must open a dialogue about preservation to decide what is important in their communities. Preservation needs to be a routine consideration in the planning process to determine local priorities. When citizens, community leaders, and decision-makers better understand the advantages of preservation, limited available resources can be directed to priority projects that will have the greatest impact. Hoosiers can achieve better outcomes for heritage resources by working together and being proactive, instead of reacting after preservation options have been reduced or eliminated.

Objective A: Facilitate community dialogue among stakeholders about why preservation is essential.

1. Encourage communities to evaluate their cultural resources as local assets and discuss why they are important.
2. Educate community leaders and residents about the financial and environmental cost of building demolition.
3. Emphasize the qualities of historic communities that attract residents and businesses.
4. Illustrate how local preservation efforts fit with resource conservation and environmental values.
5. Work with appropriate agencies to enforce existing laws to protect cultural resources.

Objective B: Integrate preservation into the community planning and local decision-making processes.

1. Encourage local preservation organizations and advocates to participate in local planning.
2. Educate decision-makers about the positive impacts of preservation and smart growth on community planning.
3. Encourage local governments to enact laws to protect historic resources such as appropriate zoning and local preservation ordinances.
4. Prioritize community preservation and planning efforts based on the identification and evaluation of local assets.
5. Promote reinvestment in existing buildings and infrastructure as a viable planning strategy.
6. Maintain preservation-friendly activities as a priority in the allocation of limited resources.
7. Advocate for the continued use of community landmark buildings.
8. Seek or create opportunities for appropriate reuse of vacant buildings.

Objective C: Undertake locally important heritage projects and activities.

1. Nominate cultural resources to the National Register of Historic Places and the Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structures.
2. Identify and document cultural resources through professional surveys.
3. Encourage the documentation and recognition of under-represented cultural resources.
4. Take advantage of grant programs, federal and state tax credits, and other funding options to promote local preservation and archaeology activities.
5. Use mandated review processes and enforcement of federal and state laws and local ordinances to reduce adverse effects on cultural resources.
6. Provide training opportunities on a wide variety of topics to educate professional and avocational preservationists and archaeologists.
7. Prepare appropriate and timely responses to anticipated projects as well as unforeseen and natural events that affect cultural resources.
8. Use any available programs to implement your community's heritage values.

How do historic neighborhoods and communities contribute to quality of life? What are ways to communicate those virtues to government planners, developers, businesses, and homeowners?

What local preservation projects have benefitted your community? How can those examples be used to promote similar reinvestments?

Are there laws that discourage preservation that could be amended? Which existing laws protecting cultural resources could be better enforced?

What are ways that planning for transportation, infrastructure, development, and reinvestment can include preservation? How can preservation advocates participate in that process?

What are ways that we can maintain preservation as a priority even when funding is limited?

How can vacant or under-utilized buildings be adapted and reused? Are there local needs that could be met by reinvesting in existing buildings?

Which historic properties in your community have been overlooked? How can you recognize, document, and protect them?

GOAL 4: Advance preservation as economic development.

Preservationists must combat the misconception that preservation activity can be pursued only when times are good and financial resources are plentiful, and that it is a luxury we can't afford when money is scarce. In fact, preservation can be an effective economic development strategy. It creates jobs and employs local workers; it generates revenue from sales tax, state and local income tax, and an expanded local property tax base; it utilizes community infrastructure that has already been built and paid for; and it can slow the need to use public funds for costly infrastructure extensions to new suburbs. All citizens need to understand how preservation makes financial sense, and they need to make preservation a priority consideration in how their communities plan, grow, and spend limited financial resources.

Objective A: Advertise and convey the benefits of preservation.

1. Teach preservation advocates how to make the economic arguments for preservation.
2. Demonstrate how preservation results in local job creation, increased revenue for communities, energy conservation, and improved quality of life and civic pride.
3. Use case studies and statistics to advocate for the rehabilitation and reuse of historic resources as an economically viable alternative to new construction.
4. Publicize the positive financial impact preservation can have on a local economy.

Objective B: Promote investment in preservation of all cultural resources.

1. Identify and share information about private and public funding sources available for cultural resources.
2. Advocate for preservation to be a priority within available public funding sources.
3. Advocate for preservation to be a distinct category in community foundation grants and other private funding sources.
4. Promote investment in the reuse of vacant and under-utilized historic buildings to create business, office, and residential spaces.
5. Invest in historic commercial areas, infrastructure, and neighborhoods to attract new residents and businesses.
6. Promote cultural resources as destinations to increase heritage tourism and economic development.

What local preservation projects could be used to illustrate positive economic impacts?

Who are local financial professionals that could assist with developing technical materials or case studies?

How much economic activity has resulted from all preservation projects in your community?

Which financial incentives would be most helpful? Do they already exist? How could they be improved?

What are your community's heritage assets? What resources could become assets? What do they need?

CHAPTER 5: A CALL TO ACTION – HOW YOU CAN HELP

Hoosiers can get involved in the preservation movement in many different ways. It doesn't require significant financial investment or donating countless hours of volunteer labor. There are numerous opportunities to promote heritage preservation, both big and small. The following list is arranged by partner type – find one or more places where you fit in and see what you can do. Can you think of other creative ways to promote and participate in preservation and archaeology in Indiana?

Not-For-Profit and Heritage-Related Organizations

Historic Preservation, Archaeology, Neighborhood, Community, Arts, Cultural, and Other Organizations, Historical Societies, Museums, and Libraries

- Locate in a historic building.
- Apply to grant programs that assist local heritage projects, such as the DHPA's "Historic Preservation Fund," Indiana Humanities' "Historic Preservation Education Grants," Indiana Landmarks' "Endangered Places Program," and other sources.
- Sponsor historic preservation education programs and speakers; the Cornelius O'Brien Lecture Series awards grants to pay out-of-state preservation experts to speak to public audiences in Indiana.
- Host or participate in cultural and ethnic heritage festivals.
- Host or coordinate Indiana Archaeology Month and Preservation Month activities and observances.
- Develop heritage tourism materials and promote local or regional heritage tourism attractions.
- Nominate locally important historic sites, structures, and districts to the National Register of Historic Places, especially resources associated with under-represented groups.
- Digitize primary source materials on community history and make them publicly accessible.
- Make historic preservation information available to professionals, teachers, elected officials, and the general public.
- Use new technology and social media to communicate your organization's message and news to more people faster and more cost-effectively than printed newsletters and mailings.
- Develop and implement emergency management plans and procedures as a way to protect historic resources, artifacts, collections, and documents during and after disasters.
- Advocate for the creation and adoption of local preservation plans by municipal governments.
- Attend "Preserving Historic Places: Indiana's Statewide Preservation Conference" – co-hosted each year by the DHPA, Indiana University, and Indiana Landmarks – to network with counterparts and learn more about preservation and program opportunities.

Government

Elected Officials, State and Federal Agencies, Municipal and County Governments, Planning Commissions, and Local Historic Preservation Commissions

- Maintain offices in historic buildings and historic districts.
- Develop and adopt a preservation plan as part of the community's comprehensive plan.
- Adopt a preservation ordinance and establish a local preservation commission.
- Apply to be designated as a Certified Local Government (CLG) if your community already has an established local preservation commission.
- Participate in intensive commission training opportunities, such as the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions' bi-annual Forum and Commission Assistance and Mentoring Program (CAMP).
- Prepare emergency management plans and procedures that take historic resources into consideration.
- Adopt zoning policies and tax incentives that benefit preservation and revitalization activities.
- Support policies that reduce sprawl and encourage adaptive reuse strategies.
- Increase funding for preservation programs and activities.
- Include historic preservation and archaeology as funding priorities in any grant and incentive programs.
- Conduct or support historic and archaeological resource surveys.

- Create or add historic resource layers to GIS databases and maps.
- Cooperate with the State Historic Preservation Office on Section 106 and state regulations.
- Begin using the State Historic Architecture and Archaeological Resource Database (SHAARD) and GIS layer.
- Start an awards program to recognize and highlight outstanding local preservation projects.
- Attend “Preserving Historic Places: Indiana’s Statewide Preservation Conference” – co-hosted each year by the DHPA, Indiana University, and Indiana Landmarks – to network with counterparts and learn more about preservation and program opportunities.
- Undertake a significant local heritage project as a way to celebrate the 200th anniversary of Indiana’s statehood.

Owners of Historic Properties

Businesses, Homeowners, Churches, Colleges & Universities, and Governments

- Reuse historic buildings as an alternative to demolition and new construction.
- Research your historic property and write about its history.
- Learn about and take advantage of any available financial incentive opportunities, such as tax credits, grant programs, low-interest loans, façade improvement programs, and TIF districts.
- Participate in your community’s Main Street program or your neighborhood association.
- Advocate for and support local improvement projects and programs that benefit preservation.
- Regularly inspect your historic property, develop a maintenance schedule, perform routine preventive maintenance to avoid costly repairs, and address problems in a timely manner.
- Retain and rehabilitate historic windows and doors and add interior or exterior storm units to improve energy efficiency as a cost-effective alternative to replacement.
- Take advantage of technical assistance and information tools for best practices, such as *Preservation Briefs* and other materials available from the National Park Service and other sources.

Professionals

Historians, Architects, Engineers, Planners, Developers, and Realtors

- Educate yourself about the history and development of your community, historic architectural styles, and historic preservation programs and funding opportunities.
- Learn how a preservation ordinance regulates specific exterior alteration activities in your community and attend a local preservation commission meeting to understand how the approval process works.
- Develop creative ways to stabilize, rehabilitate, and market vacant or under-used historic buildings.
- Educate yourself and others about the economic, social, and environmental benefits of historic preservation.
- Review the growing body of literature about how to cost-effectively improve energy efficiency in historic buildings while retaining historic features and fabric.
- Use available tools, programs, and technical assistance to create and promote preservation strategies that meet the needs of your community.
- Respect and promote the unique qualities and features of historic properties, neighborhoods, and commercial areas.

Teachers & Educators

Elementary, Middle, and High School Teachers, and Home School Educators

- Use “Teaching with Historic Places” and “Discover Our Shared Heritage Travel Itineraries” from the National Park Service to incorporate historic properties into lesson plans for social studies, local or state history, government, and geography.
- Use or adapt heritage-related lesson plans posted on the DHPA’s website.
- Use Indiana’s ethnic heritage and resources in lesson plans for related foreign languages.
- Teach students how to conduct research with primary source materials, such as historical maps, city directories, census data, diaries, letters, and newspapers.

- Participate in Indiana Archaeology Month activities and use nearby or regional archaeological dig “open houses” as field trip venues.
- Participate in or devise your own Indiana Preservation Month activities as a way of getting children and youth to look at and think about the fabric of their own communities.
- Encourage students to enroll in any heritage-focused courses, programs, or experiences that are available outside the classroom.

Everyone

Individuals, Children and Youth, Families

- Use and promote *Indiana’s Cultural Resources Management Plan*.
- Volunteer for preservation or archaeology efforts and projects.
- Patronize locally owned stores, restaurants, and arts and entertainment venues in your downtown or historic areas.
- Be a heritage tourist – visit Indiana’s historic sites and communities and travel on Scenic Byways.
- Become a member of your local historical society and/or grassroots preservation organization.
- Donate to historic preservation and archaeology organizations and causes, such as the Archeology Preservation Trust Fund.
- Buy an Indiana Heritage Trust license plate for your vehicle.
- Join an avocational archaeology group or the “friends group” for a historic site in your community or region.
- Attend Indiana Archaeology Month, Preservation Month, and other heritage events and observances.
- Respect greenspace, rural resources, landscapes, and the environment.
- Understand that preservation helps the environment – it REDUCES debris sent to landfills and the need for new construction materials, it REUSES buildings and materials that already exist, and it RECYCLES salvageable materials.
- Report vandals and looters of cultural resources to local law enforcement.
- Speak out against demolitions and sprawl development.
- Advocate for more funding for preservation and archaeology.
- Attend city council, county commission, and local preservation commission meetings.
- Talk to elected officials about preservation, revitalization, and sprawl.
- Use public transportation.
- Be a preservation advocate any way you can.

**Get involved and get others involved.
Preservation can’t happen without YOU!**

APPENDIX A: INDIANA'S ON-LINE SURVEY

Following are the questions and answer options from the on-line survey used to gather public input from May through mid-October, 2011, for revision of *Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan*. The survey was intended to take the average person about 20 to 25 minutes to complete. Hard-copy versions of the survey were made available for people without Internet access. The survey questions were designed to address four themes:

- How do survey participants identify themselves and where do they live?
- What is the current preservation context and climate in Indiana?
- What is the level of public awareness of various preservation activities at both the state and local levels?
- How does the public assess the current relevance of the plan goals from 2005?

Please describe yourself and your connection to Indiana's heritage:

(Check **ONE** box for the response that **best** describes you)

- ☐ Local historical society, member or staff
- ☐ Library, museum, or arts organization, member or staff
- ☐ Cultural resource manager or consultant
- ☐ Government employee (local, state, or federal)
- ☐ Local historic preservation commission, member or staff
- ☐ Main Street organization, member or staff
- ☐ Educator (at any level)
- ☐ Student (at any level)
- ☐ Representative of cultural or ethnic group
- ☐ Not-for-profit organization, member or staff
- ☐ Owner of a historic property
- ☐ Realtor or property developer
- ☐ Professional architect, engineer, or planner
- ☐ Professional archaeologist
- ☐ Avocational archaeologist
- ☐ Professional historian
- ☐ History enthusiast and/or heritage tourist
- ☐ Community advocate
- ☐ Cemetery advocate
- ☐ Elected official (local, state, or federal)
- ☐ Citizen interested in Indiana's heritage
- ☐ Other, please describe:

What county do you live in?

(A drop-down menu listed all 92 counties plus "I live outside Indiana")

Why is it important to you to preserve Indiana's heritage?

(Check up to 5 boxes)

- ☐ Retains community character
- ☐ Creates opportunities for economic development
- ☐ Has environmental benefits like conserving energy and saving space in landfills
- ☐ Demonstrates respect for our ancestors
- ☐ Leaves a legacy for future generations to learn from and enjoy
- ☐ Brings tourism dollars to communities
- ☐ Creates educational opportunities for teaching about history and culture
- ☐ Makes for livable communities and improves quality of life
- ☐ Reduces sprawl and saves farmland and open space
- ☐ Improves our understanding of the past

How strongly do you agree with the following statement? “**My community or county** appreciates its own cultural resources and historic preservation and archaeology activities.”

- | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I agree | <input type="checkbox"/> I disagree | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat agree | <input type="checkbox"/> I strongly disagree | |

How strongly do you agree with the following statement? “**Hoosiers throughout the state** appreciate Indiana's cultural resources and historic preservation and archaeology activities.”

- | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I agree | <input type="checkbox"/> I disagree | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I somewhat agree | <input type="checkbox"/> I strongly disagree | |

In your community or county, which cultural resources do you believe are **the most threatened**?

(Check up to 6 boxes)

- ☐ Historic downtowns and commercial areas
- ☐ Rural and historic landscapes
- ☐ Historic agricultural buildings and resources
- ☐ Historic archaeology sites (dating from 1871 to 1961)
- ☐ Prehistoric archaeology sites
- ☐ Historic neighborhoods
- ☐ Ethnic neighborhoods
- ☐ Historic bridges (wood, stone, metal, or concrete)
- ☐ Transportation-related resources (gas stations, motor courts, historic signage, railroad resources, etc.)
- ☐ Lake resorts/homes; summer resort communities
- ☐ Historic theaters
- ☐ Government properties and public buildings
- ☐ Historic schools
- ☐ Industrial properties
- ☐ Churches and religious buildings
- ☐ Cemeteries and burial grounds
- ☐ Other, please describe:

From a statewide perspective, what classes of resources do you think are **the least appreciated** in Hoosiers' knowledge and understanding of the past?

(Check up to 3 boxes)

- ☐ African American resources
- ☐ Native American resources
- ☐ Mid-twentieth century resources
- ☐ Landscapes and recreational resources (such as historic parks, open spaces, golf courses, etc.)
- ☐ Community infrastructure resources (such as water towers, brick streets, bridges, etc.)
- ☐ Women's resources
- ☐ Religious resources
- ☐ Resources linked to other cultural or ethnic group(s), please specify group:
- ☐ Other, please describe:

In your community or county, what do you believe are **the most serious threats** facing heritage resources **right now?**

(Check up to 5 boxes)

- ☐ Development pressure, tear-downs, and sprawl
- ☐ Big box superstores driving out local businesses
- ☐ Owner neglect and disinvestment
- ☐ Looting and vandalism
- ☐ Industrial and agricultural practices
- ☐ Apathy
- ☐ Lack of funding, both public and private
- ☐ Lack of awareness / lack of understanding of the value and fragility of heritage resources
- ☐ Lack of awareness of laws protecting heritage resources
- ☐ Lack of legislation or ineffective legislation to protect resources / lack of appropriate enforcement
- ☐ Other, please describe:

In your community or county, what do you believe will be **the most serious threats** facing heritage resources **over the next 10 years?**

(Check up to 5 boxes)

- ☐ Development pressure, tear-downs, and sprawl
- ☐ Big box superstores driving out local businesses
- ☐ Owner neglect and disinvestment
- ☐ Looting and vandalism
- ☐ Industrial and agricultural practices
- ☐ Apathy
- ☐ Lack of funding, both public and private
- ☐ Lack of awareness / lack of understanding of the value and fragility of heritage resources
- ☐ Lack of awareness of laws protecting heritage resources
- ☐ Lack of legislation or ineffective legislation to protect resources / lack of appropriate enforcement
- ☐ Other, please describe:

What issues should be the top priorities for the **statewide preservation community** to address **over the next 10 years?**

(Check up to 3 boxes)

- ☐ Advocacy / lobbying for preservation legislation and funding
- ☐ Creation of new local preservation groups to broaden the preservation movement
- ☐ Education of decision-makers and others who influence the fate of the built environment as well as land containing archaeological resources
- ☐ Education of the general public about the importance of preserving heritage resources
- ☐ Information resources and other non-financial support to assist local / private preservation activities
- ☐ Direct investment to save endangered resources
- ☐ Community / neighborhood revitalization planning and implementation
- ☐ Legal actions to protect threatened resources and/or expansion of legal protection for resources

Prior to taking this survey, were you aware that the DNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (the State Historic Preservation Office) has staff and programs to do the following?

- Review federal projects for their effects on historic properties and archaeological resources
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Assist property owners with listing resources in the National Register of Historic Places and the State Register
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Provide competitive matching grants for certain local preservation and archaeology activities
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Assist residents of owner-occupied historic homes with applications for rehabilitation tax credits
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Assist owners of income-producing historic properties with applications for rehabilitation tax credits
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Conduct surveys to identify and document historic properties and archaeological sites
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Provide educators with heritage-related materials and speakers
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know

Prior to taking this survey, were you aware that the DNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (the State Historic Preservation Office) has staff and programs to do the following?

- Maintain a statewide electronic database of heritage resources (including archaeological sites and all types of historic buildings, structures, and other resources)
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Maintain a registry of historic cemeteries in the state
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Monitor all archaeological activity in the state and investigate disturbances of archaeological sites
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Provide information to the public through a website and bi-monthly e-newsletter
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Co-sponsor an annual statewide conference with educational content on preservation and archaeology topics
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know
- Assists a state commission to make recommendations for preservation of historic courthouses
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it does
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I think maybe it does
 - ☐ I don't know

Are you aware if your community or county is served by any of the following entities?

- Local or county historic preservation commission
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not
- Local non-profit preservation organization
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not
- Regional non-profit preservation organization
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not
- Local or county historical society / museum
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not
- County historian
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not
- Avocational archaeology group
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not
- Cemetery preservation committee or commission
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not
- Local economic development / main street organization / community development corporation
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not
- Statewide preservation advocacy organization
 - ☐ Yes, I know that it is
 - ☐ I think maybe it is
 - ☐ Don't know / not sure
 - ☐ I don't think it is
 - ☐ No, I know that it is not

What training, information, or education topics would be **the most useful** to you and your community in its preservation efforts?

(Choose up to 5)

- ☐ Rehabilitation of historic masonry or woodwork
- ☐ Rehabilitation of historic windows
- ☐ Stewardship of archaeological sites
- ☐ Energy efficiency and weatherization in historic buildings
- ☐ Lead paint removal and safe work practices
- ☐ Training for local preservation commissions
- ☐ How to create local commissions
- ☐ Section 106 process / review of federal projects for affects on historic resources
- ☐ National Register nomination process
- ☐ Training for Qualified Professionals
- ☐ Financial incentives for preservation and archaeology
- ☐ Training on laws protecting resources
- ☐ Other, please describe:

Since 2005, do you believe that Indiana has **made progress** toward meeting these five broad goals?

Goal #1: Increase public understanding and support for historic preservation and archaeology

- ☐ Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts
- ☐ Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts
- ☐ Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts
- ☐ Very little or no progress made
- ☐ Don't know / not sure

Goal #2: Reverse the decline of main streets and downtown commercial areas.

- ☐ Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts
- ☐ Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts
- ☐ Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts
- ☐ Very little or no progress made
- ☐ Don't know / not sure

Goal #3: Strengthen preservation efforts for non-traditional resource types.

- ☐ Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts
- ☐ Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts
- ☐ Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts
- ☐ Very little or no progress made
- ☐ Don't know / not sure

Goal #4: Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions.

- ☐ Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts
- ☐ Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts
- ☐ Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts
- ☐ Very little or no progress made
- ☐ Don't know / not sure

Goal #5: Increase cultural and ethnic diversity in the preservation movement.

- ☐ Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts
- ☐ Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts
- ☐ Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts
- ☐ Very little or no progress made
- ☐ Don't know / not sure

Do you believe that these five broad goals are **still relevant** and important work for the preservation community?

Goal #1: Increase public understanding and support for historic preservation and archaeology

- | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> Less relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Still relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> No longer relevant | |

Goal #2: Reverse the decline of main streets and downtown commercial areas.

- | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> Less relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Still relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> No longer relevant | |

Goal #3: Strengthen preservation efforts for non-traditional resource types.

- | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> Less relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Still relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> No longer relevant | |

Goal #4: Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions.

- | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> Less relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Still relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> No longer relevant | |

Goal #5: Increase cultural and ethnic diversity in the preservation movement.

- | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> Less relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Still relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> No longer relevant | |

What additional goals, programs, or strategies do you think could help preserve Indiana's heritage?

(Enter answer in text box)

APPENDIX B: RESULTS OF THE ON-LINE SURVEY

Following is a statistical overview of the survey response data gathered between May and mid-June of 2011.

PART 1: How do survey participants identify themselves and where do they live?

This category of questions was used to see how well the survey met the goal of reaching a broad cross-section of Hoosiers and how well the survey data showed geographic representation all across the state.

Please describe yourself and your connection to Indiana's heritage:

Participants were asked to check one box for the response that best described or represented them.

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:
1. Citizen interested in Indiana's heritage	22.8%	862
2. Government employee (local, state, or federal)	15.9%	603
3. Not-for-profit organization, member or staff	8.5%	320
4. Local historical society, member or staff	6.9%	261
5. Library, museum, or arts organization, member or staff	6.6%	249
6. Educator (at any level)	5.7%	217
7. Owner of a historic property	4.4%	166
8. Elected official (local, state, or federal)	4.2%	158
9. History enthusiast and/or heritage tourist	4.1%	156
10. Professional architect, engineer, or planner	3.3%	126
11. Local historic preservation commission, member or staff	2.6%	99
12. Community advocate	2.3%	88
13. Main Street organization, member or staff	2.0%	76
14. Archaeologist, professional or avocational (combined)	2.0%	76
15. Student (at any level)	1.7%	64
16. Cultural resource manager or consultant	1.4%	52
17. Other – general, not specific	1.4%	52
18. Cemetery advocate	1.1%	42
19. Realtor or property developer	1.0%	39
20. Professional historian	0.7%	25
21. Other – genealogist	0.5%	19
22. Other – business interest	0.3%	12
23. Representative of cultural or ethnic group	0.3%	11
24. Other – local economic development	0.2%	9
25. Other – tourism	0.1%	5

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,787

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 26

The survey provided 22 answer options, including "Other." However, for analysis purposes, the responses for "Professional Archaeologist" and "Avocational Archaeologist" were combined. Also, the narrative responses following a selection of "Other" were analyzed to distribute them among existing categories where it was clearly possible to do so. Of the remaining "Other" responses, four additional categories emerged and were recognized as subsets under "Other" to make for a total of 25 categories.

Note that the top 10 choice selections encompassed 82% of all people taking the survey. Also, the top response of "Citizen interested in Indiana's heritage" (nearly one quarter of all respondents) shows that the survey successfully reached a segment of the general population without any direct connections to the preservation movement.

What county do you live in?

Top 15 of 92 Counties:		County Population*	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:
1.	Marion	903,393	11.4%	430
2.	Kosciusko	77,358	4.9%	184
3.	Washington	28,262	3.8%	143
4.	White	24,643	2.8%	107
5.	Jackson	42,376	2.7%	102
6.	Hamilton	274,569	2.4%	89
7.	Starke	23,363	2.3%	85
8.	Vigo	107,848	2.1%	80
9.	Tippecanoe	172,780	1.9%	73
10.	Fayette	24,277	1.9%	70
11.	Huntington	37,124	1.8%	68
12.	Rush	17,392	1.8%	66
13.	Steuben	34,185	1.7%	64
14.	Johnson	139,654	1.6%	62
15.	Scott	24,181	1.6%	61

**Population figures are from the 2010 U.S. Census and are provided only for comparative purposes. The differences in population among the top 15 counties show that there was no direct correlation between a county's population and the strength of its numeric response rate. The fact that a number of rural counties with small populations ranked among the top 15 illustrates how much survey promotion efforts often relied on local supporters who were willing to go to great lengths to share the survey with others and encourage their participation.*

Number of Responses:		Number of Responses:		Number of Responses:	
16.	Monroe	60	42.	Lawrence	33
17.	St. Joseph	60	43.	Carroll	32
18.	Delaware	59	44.	Cass	29
19.	Elkhart	54	45.	LaPorte	29
20.	Dubois	52	46.	Morgan	29
21.	Decatur	50	47.	Harrison	28
22.	Parke	48	48.	Wells	27
23.	Pike	48	49.	Clark	25
24.	Lake	47	50.	Knox	24
25.	Whitley	45	51.	Putnam	24
26.	Allen	44	52.	Howard	22
27.	Orange	44	53.	Madison	22
28.	Hancock	40	54.	Shelby	22
29.	Vanderburgh	40	55.	Bartholomew	21
30.	Wayne	40	56.	Owen	20
31.	Sullivan	39	57.	Wabash	20
32.	Union	38	58.	Boone	19
33.	Fountain	37	59.	LaGrange	19
34.	Martin	36	60.	Henry	18
35.	Warren	36	61.	Posey	18
36.	Warrick	35	62.	Clay	17
37.	Benton	34	63.	Crawford	17
38.	Porter	34	64.	Floyd	17
39.	Hendricks	33	65.	Marshall	17
40.	Jefferson	33	66.	Perry	17
41.	Jennings	33	67.	Daviess	16
68.	Franklin	16	88.	Miami	10
69.	Montgomery	16	89.	Dearborn	9
70.	Adams	15	90.	Ohio	9
71.	Blackford	15	91.	Clinton	8
72.	Grant	15	92.	Pulaski	7
73.	Switzerland	15			
74.	Vermillion	15			
75.	Brown	14			
76.	Greene	14			
77.	Ripley	14			
78.	Jasper	13			
79.	Dekalb	12			
80.	Gibson	12			
81.	Jay	12			
82.	Newton	12			
83.	Noble	12			
84.	Spencer	12			
85.	Tipton	12			
86.	Fulton	11			
87.	Randolph	11			

Number of participants from Indiana: 3,696
 Number of participants that indicated living outside Indiana: 75
 Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 42

PART 2: What is the current preservation context and climate in Indiana?

This category of questions was used to understand the public's perception of preservation in general, as well as what the public sees as the most endangered resources, the least understood resources, the greatest threats to cultural resources now and in the future, the most important issues to address over the next decade, and the greatest needs for assistance.

Why is it important to you to preserve Indiana's heritage?

Participants were asked to select up to 5 choices.

	Number of Responses:
1. Leaves a legacy for future generations to learn from and enjoy	2,937
2. Retains community character	2,460
3. Creates educational opportunities for teaching about history and culture	2,140
4. Improves our understanding of the past	2,099
5. Makes for livable communities and improves quality of life	1,539
6. Demonstrates respect for our ancestors	1,491
7. Brings tourism dollars to communities	1,435
8. Creates opportunities for economic development	1,223
9. Reduces sprawl and saves farmland and open space	1,007
10. Has environmental benefits like conserving energy and saving space in landfills	742

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,788

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 25

Participants could select up to 5 choices. Note that the top 5 of 10 choice selections collectively garnered 65% of all votes cast on this question.

How strongly do you agree with the following statement? "My community or county appreciates its own cultural resources and historic preservation and archaeology activities."

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:	
Strongly agree	13.0%	484	
Agree	34.8%	1,297	<
Somewhat agree	34.4%	1,280	<
Don't know / Not sure	3.7%	136	
Somewhat disagree	8.3%	309	
Disagree	3.8%	141	
Strongly disagree	2.0%	73	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,720

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 93

Note that the combination of "Strongly agree" with "Agree" represents 48% of all responses, while the combination of "Agree" with "Somewhat Agree" represents 69% of all responses.

How strongly do you agree with the following statement? "Hoosiers throughout the state appreciate Indiana's cultural resources and historic preservation and archaeology activities."

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:	
Strongly agree	5.6%	205	
Agree	31.9%	1,174	<
Somewhat agree	39.8%	1,464	<
Don't know / Not sure	9.1%	336	
Somewhat disagree	10.0%	368	
Disagree	3.0%	110	
Strongly disagree	0.6%	23	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,680
 Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 133

Note that the combination of “Strongly agree” with “Agree” represents 38% of all responses, while the combination of “Agree” with “Somewhat Agree” represents 72% of survey participants.

These statistics indicate that survey participants had a somewhat more favorable impression of support for preservation at their local level than they recognized statewide.

In your community or county, which cultural resources do you believe are the most threatened?

Participants were asked to select up to 6 choices.

	Number of Responses:
1. Historic downtowns and commercial areas	2,319
2. Rural and historic landscapes	1,697
3. Cemeteries and burial grounds	1,358
4. Historic neighborhoods	1,303
5. Historic bridges (wood, stone, metal, or concrete)	1,226
6. Historic schools	1,070
7. Historic agricultural buildings and resources	973
8. Transportation-related resources	736
9. Historic theaters	702
10. Churches and religious buildings	693
11. Historic archaeology sites (dating from 1871 to 1961)	647
12. Government properties and public buildings	491
13. Prehistoric archaeology sites	490
14. Industrial properties	305
15. Ethnic neighborhoods	273
16. Lake resorts/homes; summer resort communities	252
17. Other	157

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,501
 Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 312

Participants could select up to 6 choices. Note that the top 6 of 17 choice selections collectively garnered 61% of all votes cast on this question.

From a statewide perspective, what classes of resources do you think are the least appreciated in Hoosiers’ knowledge and understanding of the past?

Participants were asked to select up to 3 choices.

	Number of Responses:
1. Native American resources	1,768 (tie)
2. Community infrastructure resources	1,768 (tie)
3. Landscapes and recreational resources	1,171
4. Mid-twentieth century resources	1,062
5. African American resources	985
6. Women’s resources	657
7. Religious resources	556
8. Resources linked to other cultural or ethnic group(s)	115

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,437
 Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 376

Participants could select up to 3 choices. Note that the top 3 of 8 choice selections collectively garnered 58% of all votes cast on this question.

For the question above, are there any others (least appreciated classes of resources) not listed?

A text box was provided for survey participants to “write in” a short answer. More than 600 narrative responses were submitted, but almost half of these responses either were not clear enough or not specific enough to derive meaningful data. The 52% of clear responses were carefully analyzed and grouped into more than 25 obvious categories. The top 8 categories were:

	Number of Responses:
1. Rural / agricultural resources	55
2. Nature / natural resources	30
3. Industrial resources	23
4. Cemeteries	21
5. Transportation resources	20
6. Public / government properties	17
7. Ethnic / immigrant / minority resources	17
8. Schools	16

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 667

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 3,146

Although informative, note that these top 8 categories represent a very small statistical sample as compared to the number of votes cast for the 8 choice selections offered in the previous question. Also, one of these top 8 categories (Ethnic / immigrant / minority resources) might seem to fit within one of the provided choices under the previous question (Resources linked to other cultural or ethnic groups(s)).

In your community or county, what do you believe are the most serious threats facing heritage resources right now?

Participants were asked to select up to 5 choices.

	Number of Responses:
1. Lack of funding, both public and private	2,582
2. Lack of awareness / understanding of the value and fragility of heritage resources	2,112
3. Owner neglect and disinvestment	1,892
4. Apathy	1,761
5. Development pressure, tear-downs, and sprawl	1,484
6. Big box superstores driving out local businesses	1,435
7. Lack of legislation or ineffective legislation to protect resources / lack of enforcement	789
8. Lack of awareness of laws protecting heritage resources	758
9. Looting and vandalism	630
10. Industrial and agricultural practices	354
11. Other	176

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,505

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 308

Participants could select up to 5 choices. Note that the top 5 of 11 choice selections collectively garnered 70% of all votes cast on this question.

In your community or county, what do you believe will be the most serious threats facing heritage resources over the next 10 years?

Participants were asked to select up to 5 choices.

	Number of Responses:
1. Lack of funding, both public and private	2,689
2. Owner neglect and disinvestment	1,910
3. Lack of awareness / lack of understanding of the value and fragility of heritage resources	1,836
4. Development pressure, tear-downs, and sprawl	1,760
5. Apathy	1,730
6. Big box superstores driving out local businesses	1,241
7. Lack of legislation or ineffective legislation to protect resources / lack of enforcement	969
8. Lack of awareness of laws protecting heritage resources	667
9. Looting and vandalism	596
10. Industrial and agricultural practices	402
11. Other	143

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,500

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 313

Participants could select up to 5 choices. Note that the top 5 of 11 choice selections collectively garnered 71% of all votes cast on this question. Compared to the previous question, statistical analysis shows that the public sees “future threats” being essentially the same as “current threats.”

What issues should be the top priorities for the statewide preservation community to address over the next 10 years?

Participants were asked to select up to 3 choices.

	Number of Responses:
1. Education of the general public about the importance of preserving heritage resources	2,155
2. Education of decision-makers and others who influence the fate of the built environment as well as land containing archaeological resources	1,695
3. Community / neighborhood revitalization planning and implementation	1,548
4. Direct investment to save endangered resources	1,308
5. Advocacy / lobbying for preservation legislation and funding	1,136
6. Information resources and other non-financial support to assist local / private preservation activities	741
7. Creation of new local preservation groups to broaden the preservation movement	657
8. Legal actions to protect threatened resources and/or expansion of legal protection for resources	519

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,493

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 320

Participants could select up to 3 choices. Note that the top 3 of 8 choice selections collectively garnered 55% of all votes cast on this question.

What training, information, or education topics would be the most useful to you and your community in its preservation efforts?

Participants were asked to select up to 5 choices.

	Number of Responses:
1. Financial incentives for preservation and archaeology	2,296
2. Energy efficiency and weatherization in historic buildings	1,571
3. Training for local preservation commissions	1,417
4. Training on laws protecting resources	1,201
5. Rehabilitation of historic masonry or woodwork	1,189
6. Stewardship of archaeological sites	988
7. Training for Qualified Professionals	973
8. Rehabilitation of historic windows	881
9. How to create local commissions	682
10. Lead paint removal and safe work practices	610
11. National Register nomination process	581
12. Section 106 process / review of federal projects for affects on historic resources	526
13. Other, please describe:	183

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,302

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 511

Participants could select up to 5 choices. Note that the top 5 of 13 choice selections collectively garnered 59% of all votes cast on this question.

What additional goals, programs, or strategies do you think could help preserve Indiana's heritage?

A text box was provided for survey participants to "write in" an optional narrative response. More than 600 responses were submitted, but one quarter of these responses either was not clear enough or not specific enough to derive meaningful data or they were singular comments that did not clearly fit within any suggested category. The remaining responses were carefully grouped into obvious categories. The top 5 categories were:

	Number of Responses:
1. The need for funding and financial incentives	105
2. The need for preservation education for children and youth / lawmakers / the general public	92
3. The need to increase public awareness of preservation	52
4. Comments specifically directed at the DHPA (including praise, criticism, and suggestions)	41
5. The need for partnership efforts	18

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 622

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 3,191

A total of 21 distinct categories emerged from the responses. These top 5 categories encompassed 50% of all narrative responses submitted. The 16 additional categories were quite small – some included just 3 similar responses – and covered such wide-ranging ideas as: the need for specialized training on various topics, issues pertaining to rural areas, combating sprawl, promoting heritage tourism, sustainability, and the need for advocacy and leadership.

PART 3: What is the level of public awareness of various preservation activities at both the state and local levels?

This category of questions was used to gauge public awareness of various preservation activities and to understand where the DHPA and the preservation community at large may need to do a better job of reaching out to the general public to promote programs, activities, and opportunities.

Prior to taking this survey, were you aware that the DNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (the State Historic Preservation Office) has staff and programs to do the following?

For analysis purposes, the DHPA considered responses of “Yes, I know that it does” and “I think maybe it does” as equating with some level of awareness, whereas the responses of “No, I didn’t know that” and “I don’t know” were considered to indicate a general lack of awareness. Therefore, the combined percentage of the top two choices (above the dashed line) was compared to the combined percentage of the bottom two choices (below the dashed line) to see which was greater as a general indicator of public awareness. The 13 items are arranged from highest level of public awareness to lowest.

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:		Combined Percentages:
• Assist property owners with listing resources in the National Register of Historic Places and the State Register				
Yes, I know that it does	49.8%	1,679		
I think maybe it does	24.1%	812	Some level of awareness =	73.9% <<
<hr/>				
No, I didn’t know that	16.2%	546	General lack of awareness =	26.1%
I don’t know	9.9%	335		

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,372
Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 441

• Maintain a registry of historic cemeteries in the state				
Yes, I know that it does	44.5%	1,497		
I think maybe it does	27.2%	915	Some level of awareness =	71.8% <<
<hr/>				
No, I didn’t know that	16.9%	569	General lack of awareness =	28.2%
I don’t know	11.3%	380		

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,361
Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 452

• Monitor all archaeological activity in the state and investigate disturbances of archaeological sites				
Yes, I know that it does	40.8%	1,358		
I think maybe it does	26.8%	894	Some level of awareness =	67.6% <<
<hr/>				
No, I didn’t know that	18.0%	599	General lack of awareness =	32.4%
I don’t know	14.4%	481		

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,332
Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 481

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:		Combined Percentages:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Maintain a statewide electronic database of heritage resources (including archaeological sites and all types of historic buildings, structures, and other resources)				
Yes, I know that it does	39.5%	1,331		
I think maybe it does	28.0%	944	Some level of awareness =	67.6% <<
No, I didn't know that	19.8%	663	General lack of awareness =	32.4%
I don't know	12.7%	428		
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,366		
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		447		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Review federal projects for their effects on historic properties and archaeological resources				
Yes, I know that it does	44.5%	1,498		
I think maybe it does	22.4%	753	Some level of awareness =	66.9% <<
No, I didn't know that	20.1%	676	General lack of awareness =	33.1%
I don't know	13.0%	439		
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,366		
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		447		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Conduct surveys to identify and document historic properties and archaeological sites				
Yes, I know that it does	40.3%	1,355		
I think maybe it does	25.8%	868	Some level of awareness =	66.1% <<
No, I didn't know that	19.2%	646	General lack of awareness =	33.9%
I don't know	14.7%	494		
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,363		
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		450		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide educators with heritage-related materials and speakers				
Yes, I know that it does	34.7%	1,166		
I think maybe it does	27.6%	926	Some level of awareness =	62.3% <<
No, I didn't know that	19.8%	666	General lack of awareness =	37.7%
I don't know	17.9%	600		
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,358		
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		455		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide competitive matching grants for certain local preservation and archaeology activities				
Yes, I know that it does	31.0%	1,039		
I think maybe it does	25.3%	848	Some level of awareness =	56.3% <<
No, I didn't know that	22.3%	748	General lack of awareness =	43.7%
I don't know	21.4%	717		
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,352		
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		461		

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:		Combined Percentages:	
• Assist a state commission to make recommendations for preservation of historic courthouses					
Yes, I know that it does	24.4%	817			
I think maybe it does	29.2%	978	Some level of awareness =	53.6%	<
No, I didn't know that	24.7%	827	General lack of awareness =	46.4%	<
I don't know	21.6%	724			
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,346			
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		467			
• Assist residents of owner-occupied historic homes with applications for rehabilitation tax credits					
Yes, I know that it does	25.7%	862			
I think maybe it does	26.2%	877	Some level of awareness =	51.9%	<
No, I didn't know that	24.6%	825	General lack of awareness =	48.1%	<
I don't know	23.4%	785			
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,349			
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		464			
• Provide information to the public through a website and bi-monthly e-newsletter					
Yes, I know that it does	28.6%	956			
I think maybe it does	20.8%	697	Some level of awareness =	49.4%	<
No, I didn't know that	26.2%	876	General lack of awareness =	50.6%	<
I don't know	24.4%	816			
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,345			
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		468			
• Assist owners of income-producing historic properties with applications for rehabilitation tax credits					
Yes, I know that it does	23.3%	777			
I think maybe it does	24.9%	829	Some level of awareness =	48.2%	<
No, I didn't know that	25.3%	844	General lack of awareness =	51.8%	<
I don't know	26.5%	885			
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,335			
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		478			
• Co-sponsor an annual statewide conference with educational content on preservation and archaeology topics					
Yes, I know that it does	25.0%	836			
I think maybe it does	19.8%	660	Some level of awareness =	44.8%	
No, I didn't know that	27.5%	917	General lack of awareness =	55.2%	<<
I don't know	27.7%	925			
Number of participants that answered this survey question:		3,338			
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:		475			

Overall, 6 of 13 programs were recognized by two-thirds or more of survey participants answering the questions, while two additional programs were recognized by well over half of survey participants. Five programs were about evenly split between aware and unaware responses.

Are you aware if your community or county is served by any of the following entities?

This question was not about whether various entities existed at the local level, because not all of them do exist in every county. Instead, this question was intended to gauge how aware of these entities the public is in general.

For analysis purposes, the DHPA considered responses of “Yes, I know that it does” and “No, I know that it does not” as equating with a high level of awareness, whereas the responses of “I think maybe it is” and “I don’t think it is” were considered to indicate a low level of awareness, while responses of “Don’t know / not sure” indicated no awareness. Therefore, the combined percentage of the top two choices (above the first dashed line) was compared to the combined percentage of the middle two choices (between the dashed lines) and the bottom choice (below the second dashed line) to see which was greatest as a general indicator of public awareness. The 9 items are arranged from highest level of public awareness to lowest.

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:		Combined Percentages:
• Local or county historical society / museum				
Yes, I know that it is	75.4%	2,522	High level of awareness =	76.9% <<
No, I know that it is not	1.5%	51		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	12.1%	404	Low level of awareness =	14.1%
I don’t think it is	2.0%	68		
<hr/>				
Don’t know / not sure	9.0%	300	No awareness =	9.0%

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,345

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 468

Note that a clear majority of all survey participants answering this question indicated a high level of awareness of local or county historical societies and museum.

• Local economic development / main street organization / community development corporation				
Yes, I know that it is	57.7%	1,924	High level of awareness =	59.8% <<
No, I know that it is not	2.1%	71		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	20.8%	693	Low level of awareness =	23.3%
I don’t think it is	2.5%	82		
<hr/>				
Don’t know / not sure	16.9%	563	No awareness =	16.9%

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,333

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 480

Note that a clear majority of all survey participants answering this question indicated a high level of awareness of local economic development, main street, and community development organizations.

• County historian				
Yes, I know that it is	40.0%	1,332	High level of awareness =	43.0% <<
No, I know that it is not	3.0%	101		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	21.5%	716	Low level of awareness =	27.6%
I don’t think it is	6.1%	202		
<hr/>				
Don’t know / not sure	29.4%	980	No awareness =	29.4%

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,331
Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 482

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:		Combined Percentages:
• Local or county historic preservation commission				
Yes, I know that it is	37.7%	1,258	High level of awareness =	42.9% <<
No, I know that it is not	5.2%	175		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	21.8%	726	Low level of awareness =	30.5%
I don't think it is	8.7%	290		
<hr/>				
Don't know / not sure	26.6%	889	No awareness =	26.6%

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,338
Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 475

• Local non-profit preservation organization				
Yes, I know that it is	36.4%	1,215	High level of awareness =	40.5% <<
No, I know that it is not	4.1%	138		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	20.9%	697	Low level of awareness =	29.0%
I don't think it is	8.1%	270		
<hr/>				
Don't know / not sure	30.5%	1,019	No awareness =	30.5%

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,339
Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 474

• Statewide preservation advocacy organization				
Yes, I know that it is	25.9%	857	High level of awareness =	29.8%
No, I know that it is not	3.9%	128		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	20.1%	666	Low level of awareness =	26.8%
I don't think it is	6.7%	223		
<hr/>				
Don't know / not sure	43.4%	1,438	No awareness =	43.4% <<

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,312
Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 501

• Regional non-profit preservation organization				
Yes, I know that it is	20.2%	659	High level of awareness =	24.5%
No, I know that it is not	4.2%	139		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	19.7%	641	Low level of awareness =	29.2%
I don't think it is	9.6%	312		
<hr/>				
Don't know / not sure	46.3%	1,508	No awareness =	46.3% <<

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,259
Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 554

The high percentage for lack of awareness of regional non-profit organizations was probably influenced by the fact that there are relatively few such organizations in Indiana.

- **Cemetery preservation committee or commission**

Yes, I know that it is	17.3%	570	High level of awareness =	22.0%
No, I know that it is not	4.7%	156		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	24.2%	801	Low level of awareness =	36.1%
I don't think it is	11.9%	394		
<hr/>				
Don't know / not sure	41.9%	1,385	No awareness =	41.9% <<

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,306

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 507

- **Avocational archaeology group**

Yes, I know that it is	6.0%	197	High level of awareness =	13.2%
No, I know that it is not	7.2%	237		
<hr/>				
I think maybe it is	12.8%	422	Low level of awareness =	30.9%
I don't think it is	18.1%	599		
<hr/>				
Don't know / not sure	55.9%	1,844	No awareness =	55.9% <<

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,299

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 514

The high percentage for lack of awareness of avocational archaeology groups was probably influenced by the fact that there are relatively few such organizations in Indiana. In addition, survey participants may have been confused by the term avocational.

PART 4: How does the public assess the current relevance of the plan goals from 2005?

This category of questions was used to gauge the public's perception of progress made toward achieving the previous plan goals and the continued relevance of those plan goal statements today.

Since 2005, do you believe that Indiana has made progress toward meeting these five broad goals?

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:	
<hr/>			
● Goal #1: Increase public understanding and support for historic preservation and archaeology.			
Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts	7.6%	252	
Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts	44.8%	1,476	<<
Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts	21.8%	719	
Very little or no progress made	8.6%	285	
Don't know / not sure	17.2%	566	
<hr/>			
Number of participants that answered this survey question:	3,298		
Number of participants that skipped this survey question:	515		
<hr/>			
● Goal #2: Reverse the decline of main streets and downtown commercial areas.			
Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts	8.7%	286	
Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts	43.6%	1,438	<<
Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts	23.2%	765	
Very little or no progress made	12.1%	398	
Don't know / not sure	12.4%	410	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,297
 Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 516

- **Goal #3: Strengthen preservation efforts for non-traditional resource types.**

Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts	3.6%	116	
Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts	23.9%	774	<
Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts	26.5%	859	<
Very little or no progress made	10.2%	331	
Don't know / not sure	35.8%	1,159	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,239
 Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 574

Although the largest percentage of responses fell under "Don't know / not sure," the combination of responses for "Made some progress" and "Not much progress made" was greater. Also, the percentages of responses for "Made some progress" and "Not much progress made" were extremely similar.

- **Goal #4: Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions.**

Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts	4.6%	151	
Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts	25.4%	828	<
Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts	21.6%	705	<
Very little or no progress made	7.6%	248	
Don't know / not sure	40.8%	1,329	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,261
 Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 552

Although the largest percentage of responses fell under "Don't know / not sure," the combination of responses for "Made some progress" and "Not much progress made" was greater. Also, the percentages of responses for "Made some progress" and "Not much progress made" were extremely similar.

- **Goal #5: Increase cultural and ethnic diversity in the preservation movement.**

Made a great deal of progress, but should continue current efforts	5.4%	177	
Made some progress, but need to increase current efforts	22.2%	724	<
Not much progress made, need to significantly increase efforts	22.8%	745	<
Very little or no progress made	10.4%	339	
Don't know / not sure	39.2%	1,279	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,264
 Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 549

Although the largest percentage of responses fell under "Don't know / not sure," the combination of responses for "Made some progress" and "Not much progress made" was greater. Also, the percentages of responses for "Made some progress" and "Not much progress made" were extremely similar.

Do you believe that these five broad goals are still relevant and important work for the preservation community?

	Percent of Total:	Number of Responses:	
<hr/>			
● Goal #1: Increase public understanding and support for historic preservation and archaeology.			
Highly relevant	64.7%	2,137	<<
Still relevant	31.4%	1,039	
Less relevant	1.3%	42	
No longer relevant	0.2%	6	
Don't know	2.4%	80	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,304

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 509

Note that a clear majority (nearly two-thirds) of all survey participants answering this question indicated that this goal remains highly relevant today.

● **Goal #2: Reverse the decline of main streets and downtown commercial areas.**

Highly relevant	65.2%	2,155	<<
Still relevant	29.5%	973	
Less relevant	2.4%	79	
No longer relevant	0.5%	17	
Don't know	2.4%	78	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,302

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 511

Note that a clear majority (nearly two-thirds) of all survey participants answering this question indicated that this goal remains highly relevant today.

● **Goal #3: Strengthen preservation efforts for non-traditional resource types.**

Highly relevant	39.3%	1,286	<
Still relevant	40.6%	1,332	<
Less relevant	7.6%	249	
No longer relevant	0.9%	28	
Don't know	11.6%	381	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,276

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 537

Note that the combined responses for "Highly relevant" and "Still relevant" encompass 80% of all votes cast.

● **Goal #4: Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions.**

Highly relevant	42.7%	1,397	<
Still relevant	41.1%	1,347	<
Less relevant	4.8%	156	
No longer relevant	0.6%	21	
Don't know	10.8%	353	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,274

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 539

Note that the combined responses for "Highly relevant" and "Still relevant" encompass 84% of all votes cast.

- **Goal #5: Increase cultural and ethnic diversity in the preservation movement.**

Highly relevant	38.2%	1,252	<
Still relevant	37.0%	1,213	<
Less relevant	12.6%	414	
No longer relevant	3.2%	105	
Don't know	9.0%	297	

Number of participants that answered this survey question: 3,281

Number of participants that skipped this survey question: 532

Note that the combined responses for "Highly relevant" and "Still relevant" encompass 75% of all votes cast.

APPENDIX C: PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND STRATEGIES FROM 2005 TO 2012

Indiana's previous preservation plan ran from 2005 to 2011 and was formally extended through 2012. Following are the goals, objectives, and strategy statements from that time period. This framework served as the starting point for discussions about how to revise *Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan for 2013 to 2019*.

I. Increase public understanding and support for historic preservation and archaeology.

In 1997, and again in 2003, public discussion identified the primary challenge to preservation in Indiana as the lack of general understanding of what historic and cultural resources are and why it is important to protect and preserve them. Fostering an appreciation for historic resources and building a supportive atmosphere for preservation activity begins with education. These efforts are important on all levels and in all circles of Indiana's citizenry. Although new and expanded programs continue to be implemented throughout the state, there is always room for more opportunities and strategies. Public input identified including preservation as part of Indiana history in school curriculum as a way to promote preservation to future generations now. Discussion also focused on educating decision-makers in our communities and government to consider historic resources and preservation planning. Education through general public outreach programs, such as Archaeology Month, Preservation Month, the Indiana State Fair, preservation publications and websites, can continue to raise awareness of the wealth of history in Indiana and the irreplaceable value of that heritage.

A. Raise public awareness and understanding of cultural resources.

1. Educate the public about Indiana's cultural resources and the benefits of preservation.
2. Foster understanding of the state and federal laws protecting cultural resources.
3. Educate decision-makers who influence the fate of the built environment.

B. Foster preservation and archaeology education experiences for school-aged children and the general public.

1. Encourage educators to use preservation and archaeology subjects and materials in their curriculum.
2. Use heritage sites and resources to enhance history, social studies, and language courses.
3. Promote and participate in local, regional, statewide, and national conferences on cultural resources.
4. Promote and participate in Historic Preservation Month (May) and Archaeology Month (September).

C. Create a favorable environment for preservation activity.

1. Identify and document cultural resources through professional surveys.
2. List resources in the National Register of Historic Places and the Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structures.
3. Utilize financial incentives to promote local preservation and archaeology activities.
4. Protect resources through mandated review processes and enforcement of state and federal laws.
5. Foster protection efforts through development of local preservation ordinances and heritage corridors.
6. Use new technology to streamline SHPO duties and strengthen protection efforts.

II. Reverse the decline of main streets and downtown commercial areas.

Suburbanization, unchecked sprawl, and ineffective or lack of zoning continues to threaten the sustainability of downtown commercial centers. Competition from mega-stores threatens the viability of Main Street businesses by drawing retail customers away from city centers and locally-owned establishments. In spite of tax credit opportunities and other investment strategies, the misconception about the cost of rehabilitation also continues to be pervasive, discouraging potential development. Public discussion to combat the decline of business centers focused a lot on the need to put preservation in the context of economic development. Explaining the economic benefits and feasibility of preservation would help promote it in community planning for zoning, smart growth, downtown development, and economic revitalization.

A. Communicate the advantages of preservation activity in economic terms.

1. Teach preservationists how to understand and speak the language of economics.
2. Use preservation case studies and statistics to get the attention of developers, property owners, and elected officials.
3. Publicize the positive financial impacts and spin-off benefits of preservation activities.

B. Promote preservation activity as a means of sustaining downtowns and historic areas.

1. Adopt the Main Street approach to attract, retain, coordinate, and support local businesses.
2. Work to keep post offices, schools, and government offices as anchors of downtowns and historic neighborhoods.
3. Promote sympathetic reuse and development of underutilized buildings to create housing and commercial space.
4. Emphasize “livability” in historic areas to attract new businesses and residents.
5. Use heritage tourism efforts to encourage local economic development.

C. Combat the tendency to subsidize sprawl instead of investing in existing resources.

1. Educate decision-makers about the high cost of sprawl development and its negative impacts.
2. Create barriers to sprawl through comprehensive planning, appropriate zoning, and other protection mechanisms.
3. Promote reinvestment in resources and infrastructure in historic downtowns, commercial cores, and neighborhoods.
4. Encourage appropriate infill development in historic urban cores.

III. Strengthen preservation efforts for non-traditional resource types.

Traditionally, preservation is associated with resources such as house museums, Victorian-era neighborhoods, and significant public buildings (courthouses, city halls). Archaeology is usually associated with Native American sites. Preservation and archaeology encompass many “non-traditional” types of resources that are facing a variety of threats and challenges to protection. Some examples of non-traditional resources include: bridges, cemeteries, rural and agricultural buildings, vernacular houses and commercial structures, functional buildings (industrial or transportation related) or structures from the recent past, and designed landscapes (historic estates or park and boulevard systems). Education efforts need to include non-traditional resource types to increase awareness of their contribution to Indiana history and the challenge to protect and preserve them.

A. Raise awareness of the importance of rural resources and landscapes.

1. Foster appreciation of rural resources and landscapes through public education venues.
2. Broaden the public’s recognition of resources beyond courthouses, mansions, and historic downtowns.
3. Emphasize the importance of non-traditional resources to the fabric and sense of place of rural communities.

B. Seize opportunities for new protection efforts for non-traditional resource types.

1. Partner with universities, extension offices, land trusts, and conservation groups to promote protection efforts.
2. Advocate for sensitive design of transportation routes to minimize the loss of historic resources.
3. Respond proactively to emerging issues by developing partnerships, programs, and awareness campaigns.
4. Promote increased economic viability of threatened rural and non-traditional resources.
5. Use new technology to disseminate information about the presence and importance of under-recognized resources.

IV. Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions.

Partnerships with federal, state, and local agencies and organizations have gone a long way to promoting preservation-friendly policies and activity. Increasing collaboration among partners to achieve common goals is essential as agencies and organizations attempt to do more with less and will contribute to more concentrated services. However, public discussion also expressed the need to reach out beyond traditional allies to other partners, such as environmental and conservation groups or merchant and neighborhood associations, who would be sympathetic to preservation priorities and can help broaden the constituency.

A. Maintain and strengthen connections among current preservation partners.

1. Work with other state and federal agencies to streamline review processes.
2. Maintain relationships with local governments, review boards, and not-for-profit organizations.
3. Encourage new communities to join the Certified Local Government Program.

B. Identify and recruit new and non-traditional partners.

1. Look for new preservation partners among resource-oriented groups and organizations.
2. Reach out to the environmental, outdoor recreation, and cultural constituent groups.
3. Educate professionals like realtors, accountants, architects, and developers about preservation.
4. Identify opponents to preservation and seek to educate them about preservation's benefits.

C. Increase the effectiveness of various preservation efforts.

1. Increase communication between preservation partners at all levels.
2. Pursue collaborative efforts between partners to maximize results on common objectives.

V. Increase cultural and ethnic diversity in the preservation movement.

The preservation movement has made significant efforts to broaden its constituency. These efforts have included reaching out to marginalized cultural and ethnic groups, recognizing the importance of their community's heritage, and assisting with planning to protect and preserve their historic resources. Native Americans inhabited what is now Indiana for thousands of years, but only a small percentage of sites related to their history have been surveyed and documented. African Americans were, along with Europeans, among the early settlers to establish their homes and earn their livelihoods in Indiana. Some African American Hoosiers arrived as free men and women, while others traveled through or sought refuge in Indiana having fled enslavement in the southern United States. Their legacy is a part of Indiana's story only recently being emphasized in preservation. New efforts, such as the Jewish Heritage Initiative, continue to identify and preserve the diverse ethnic and cultural heritage of the people and communities that have been and are important to Indiana's history.

A. Raise public awareness of Indiana's rich cultural and ethnic heritage.

1. Educate the public about Indiana's prehistoric and historic Native American cultures.
2. Broaden the public's recognition of the historic ethnic groups that shaped Indiana's development.
3. Include present-day cultural and ethnic groups and organizations in the preservation movement.

B. Support efforts to preserve the vestiges of Indiana's cultural and ethnic heritage.

1. Document and protect sites associated with the Underground Railroad in Indiana.
2. Identify and study Native American, African-American, and other ethnic and cultural heritage resources.
3. Look for new opportunities to partner with Indiana's under-represented cultural and ethnic groups.

GLOSSARY

Above-ground resources: a generic term that refers to vestiges of past human activity that are visible on or above the surface of the earth, such as buildings, structures, man-made landscapes, and objects such as sculptures and monuments.

Archaeology: the study of past lifeways, cultures, and cultural processes through the investigation of material remains left behind by humans.

Archaeological artifact: any material evidence of human behavior, such as any portable objects made, used, and/or modified by humans; some of the most common types of archaeological artifacts include a wide variety of stone tools and projectile points, ceramic pottery fragments, and decorative items such as metal adornments and glass beads.

Archaeological feature: any non-portable evidence of past human behavior, activity, or technology found on or below the surface of the earth; some of the most common types of archaeological features include fire pits and hearths, garbage or storage pits, post molds, evidence of house floors or basins, clusters of artifacts, human and animal burials, clusters of animal bone, and constructed earthworks such as mounds and banked enclosures.

Archaeological site: the location of one or more artifacts and/or features that indicates an instance of past human behavior or activity where evidence is left behind either on or below the ground; some of the most common types of archaeological sites include artifact caches, camp and village locations, cemeteries and burial sites, earthworks, and collections of stone debris from tool-making activities.

Below-ground resources: a generic term that refers to vestiges of past human activity that are visible on or below the surface of the earth, such as archaeological artifacts, features, and sites.

Cultural resources: a broad and collective reference to vestiges of past human activity, from the historic period or dating before written history in Indiana, inclusive of above-ground and below-ground resources.

DHPA: see Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology: a part of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, a state government agency; the DHPA serves as the federally recognized State Historic Preservation Office for Indiana; as such, the DHPA is the state-level counterpart to the National Park Service at the federal level.

Heritage resources: a broad and general reference to the archaeological features and sites and the historic buildings, structures, sites, landscapes, and objects that collectively convey the long story of human activity within a particular area.

Historic: human activities, events, and occupations occurring since the establishment of written records within a region; in Indiana, this generally refers to the period since the mid to late 1600s when the first Europeans began entering the area and recording their activities; within the field of preservation, historic is also a term commonly applied to any resource that has been determined eligible for listing in the State or National Register.

Historic preservation: a movement concerned with conserving and protecting features of the built environment, including buildings, structures, landscapes, and objects.

Indiana Historic Preservation and Archaeology Act: the state law that created the DHPA and provides for it to carry out state historic preservation and archaeological mandates and programs.

National Historic Preservation Act: this act became federal law in 1966 (16 USC 470 et seq.) and has been amended several times; it formally recognizes the importance of the nation's irreplaceable heritage, which is increasingly threatened by growth and development activities, and establishes a program for the preservation of historic properties throughout the nation; the act sets forth the required duties of State Historic Preservation Offices.

National Park Service: a part of the U.S. Department of the Interior, the NPS is the federal government agency that administers programs, mandates, and initiatives related to historic preservation.

Prehistory / prehistoric: human activities, events, and occupations occurring before the establishment of written records; in North America, this primarily includes Native American prehistoric cultures, but does not imply that these cultures did not have long, rich, and varied cultural and oral histories and traditions.

Preservation: the act of taking measures to retain the existing form, features, materials, characteristics, and integrity of a historic building, structure, landscape, object, or archaeological artifact, feature, or site; as used throughout this document, the term preservation is a comprehensive reference to the protection of all cultural resources, both above- and below-ground, historic and prehistoric, archaeological and those of the built environment.

SHPO: an acronym that can refer to the agency that is the State Historic Preservation Office or the person who is the State Historic Preservation Officer.

State Historic Preservation Office: each state is required by the National Historic Preservation Act to have a State Historic Preservation Office to administer federal preservation programs, mandates, and initiatives at the state level; for Indiana, the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology is the federally recognized State Historic Preservation Office.

State Historic Preservation Officer: each state is required by the National Historic Preservation Act to have an appointed State Historic Preservation Officer, who is ultimately responsible for the administration of federal preservation programs, mandates, and initiatives at the state level; in Indiana, the governor appoints the Director of the Department of Natural Resources, who functions as the federally recognized State Historic Preservation Officer; the Director of the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology – a unit of the Department of Natural Resources – serves as the Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

- Black, Glenn A. Angel Site: An Archaeological, Historical, and Ethnological Study. Vols. I & II. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1967.
- Bodenhamer, David J., and Robert G. Barrows, eds. The Encyclopedia of Indianapolis. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Cassity, Pratt. Maintaining Community Character: How to Establish a Local Historic District. Washington, D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- Cooper, James L. Iron Monuments to Distant Posterity: Indiana's Metal Bridges. Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 1987.
- _____. Artistry and Ingenuity in Artificial Stone: Indiana's Concrete Bridges. Greencastle, IN: James Cooper, 1997.
- Fagan, Brian M. Ancient North America. 4th ed. New York: Thames and Hudson, 2005.
- Glenn, Elizabeth, and Stuart Rafert. The Native Americans. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society Press, 2009.
- Grimmer, Anne E., Jo Ellen Hensley, Liz Petrella, and Audrey T. Tepper. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, 2011.
- Hicks, Ronald, ed. Native American Cultures of Indiana. Muncie, IN: Minnetrista Cultural Center and Ball State University, 1992.
- Jones, James R. III, and Amy L. Johnson, guest eds. Archaeology in Indiana – The Early Years. The Indiana Historian. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1999.
- _____. Archaeology in Indiana – The Science Today. The Indiana Historian. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1999.
- Kellar, James H. An Introduction to the Prehistory of Indiana. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1993.
- Lambin, Jeanne. Preserving Resources from the Recent Past. Washington, D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- Madison, James H. The Indiana Way: A State History. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Parker, Francis. Indiana Railroad Depots: A Threatened Heritage. Muncie, IN: Ball State University, 1989.
- Reps, John W. The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rubman, Kerri. A Community Guide to Saving Older Schools. Washington, D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- Rypkema, Donovan D. The Economics of Historic Preservation. Washington, D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1994.
- _____. The Economics of Rehabilitation. Washington, D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- Stafford, C. Russell. Prehistoric Peoples of Indiana. Edited by Marion T. Jackson. The Natural Heritage of Indiana. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Swartz, B.K., Jr. Indiana's Prehistoric Past. Muncie, IN: University Publications, Ball State University, 1981.

Taylor, Robert M., and Connie McBirney. Peopling Indiana: The Ethnic Experience. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996.

Manuscripts:

Tomak, Curtis H. National Register Application for the Alton Archaeological Site (12Pel71), August 1991, DHPA NR file #1092.

National Register Nominations:

National Register of Historic Places, Angel Mounds, Vanderburgh County, Indiana, National Register #66000124.

National Register of Historic Places, Mounds State Park, Anderson, Madison County, Indiana, National Register #73000022.

National Register of Historic Places, Ransom Place Historic District, Indianapolis, Marion County, Indiana, National Register #92001650.

National Register of Historic Places, Swan's Landing Archaeological Site (12HR304), New Amsterdam, Harrison County, Indiana, National Register #87000517.

National Register of Historic Places, Thornhurst Addition, Carmel, Hamilton County, Indiana, National Register #10000378.

National Register of Historic Places, Venoge Farmstead, Vevay, Switzerland County, Indiana, National Register #96001539.

National Register of Historic Places, Vurpillat Opera House, Winamac, Pulaski County, Indiana, National Register #02000201.

Reports:

Beaumont, Constance E., ed. Challenging Sprawl: Organizational Responses to a National Problem. Washington, D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1999.

Ratio Architects, Inc. Indiana's Historic Courthouses: Re-Investing in Community Treasures, A Report to the Indiana General Assembly. Indianapolis: Indiana Courthouse Preservation Advisory Commission, 2011.

State of Indiana / DHPA Publications:

Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology. Historic Indiana: Indiana Properties Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, 2003-2004. Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 2003.

Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology. Indiana Cultural Resources Management Plan 2005 to 2011. Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 2005.

Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology. Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan 1998 – 2003. Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 1998.

Jones, James R. III, and Amy L. Johnson. Early Peoples of Indiana. Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 2012.

Jones, James R. III, ed. Indiana Archaeology 1 (1). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 1997.

- Jones, James R. III, Amy L. Johnson, and Robert G. McCullough, eds. Indiana Archaeology 2 (1). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 1998.
- Jones, James R. III, and Amy L. Johnson, eds. Indiana Archaeology 4 (1). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 2009.
- Jones, James R. III, Amy L. Johnson, Cathy A. Carson, and Cathy L. Draeger-Williams, eds. Indiana Archaeology 5 (1). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 2010.
- Jones, James R. III, Amy L. Johnson, and Cathy A. Carson, eds. 2010/2011 Indiana Archaeology 5 (2). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 2011.
- Jones, James R. III, Amy L. Johnson, and Cathy A. Carson, eds. Indiana Archaeology 6 (1). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 2011.
- Redmond, Brian G., and James R. Jones III, eds. Indiana Archaeology 3 (1). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 2003.

State of Indiana / Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory Series:

- Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, ed. Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory Floyd County. Indianapolis: Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, 2008.
- Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County, and Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, eds. Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory St. Joseph County. South Bend, IN: Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County and Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, 2000.
- Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, and ARCH, Inc., eds. Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory Series for the following counties: Adams (2011), LaGrange (2009), Steuben (2008), Wells (2010). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology and ARCH, Inc., various dates as indicated.
- Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, and Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, eds. Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory Series for the following communities: Bloomington (1986, 2004), Fort Wayne (1996), Mishawaka (1995), New Albany (1994), and South Bend (1993, 2007). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology and Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, various dates as indicated.
- Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, and Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, eds. Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory Series for the following counties: Bartholomew (1980), Benton (2009), Blackford (2005), Boone (1982), Brown (1995), Carroll (1980), Cass (1984), Clark (1988), Clay (1997), Clinton (1997), Crawford (2008), Daviess (1987), Dearborn (1983), Decatur (1999), Dekalb (2003), Delaware (1985), Dubois (1998), Elkhart (1978, 2005), Fayette (1981), Floyd (1978), Fountain (1988), Franklin (1978), Fulton (1987), Gibson / Warrick (1984), Grant (1993), Greene (2000), Hamilton (1992), Hancock (1983), Harrison (1987), Hendricks (1989), Henry (1993), Howard (2003), Huntington (1982, 1997), Jackson (1988), Jasper (2002), Jay (1985), Jefferson (1989), Jennings (1989), Johnson (1985), Knox (1997), Kosciusko (1991), Lake (1996), LaPorte (1989, 2002), Lawrence (1992), Madison (1984), Marion—Center Township (1991), Marion—Decatur / Perry / Franklin Townships (1992), Marion—Pike / Lawrence Townships (1994), Marion—Warren Township (1993), Marion—Washington Township (1999), Marion—Wayne Township (1993), Marshall (1990), Miami (1998), Monroe (1989), Montgomery (1986), Morgan (1993), Newton (2009), Noble (1986), Ohio (1984), Orange (2006), Owen (1994), Perry (1992), Porter (1991), Posey (1985, 2004), Pulaski (2009), Putnam (1982), Randolph (1998), Ripley (1986), Rush (1988), St. Joseph (2006), Scott (2004), Shelby (1992), Spencer (2001), Starke (2005), Sullivan (2002), Switzerland (1980, 2006), Tippecanoe (1990), Vanderburgh (1994), Vermillion (2000), Vigo (1984), Wabash (1982), Washington (2008), Wayne (2001), White (1994), Whitley (2002). Indianapolis: Indiana

Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology and Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, various dates as indicated.

Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, and Indiana Landmarks, eds. Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory Series for the following counties: Bartholomew (2012), Carroll (2011), Franklin (2011), Parke (2010), Tipton (2010), Union (2010), Warren (2012). Indianapolis: Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology and Indiana Landmarks, various dates as indicated.